

Croatian Journal of Education
Vol.19; No.4/2017, pages: 1059-1104

Original research paper

Paper submitted: 29th August 2016

Paper accepted: 3rd February 2017

<https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v19i4.2412>

Stayin' Alive? National Language and Internationalisation of Higher Education. The Case of Slovenia

Monika Kalin Golob¹, Gaja Červ², Marko Stabej³, Mojca Stritar Kučuk
and Samo Kropivnik¹

¹Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana

²Waldorf School of Ljubljana

³Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana

Abstract

The 'dilemmas' between multilingualism in theory and English as a lingua franca in practice concern the post-Bologna European higher education as a whole. The article presents the case of Slovenia by furthering the analysis of similar quandaries present in the Slovenian (higher education) language policy. The state of affairs is addressed by acknowledging the status of Slovenian as the official language of the Republic of Slovenia, as well as the need for a greater inclusion of foreign students and teachers and for further enhancement of the quality of higher education. The results of surveys conducted among the most important stakeholders in the Slovenian higher education in October 2012, with the aim of researching the viewpoints on the use of languages of instruction in higher education, are presented. The results were analysed with a view to the expressed standpoint on language use in higher education, which led to the formation of three opinion groups within the sample of students and university teachers of the University of Ljubljana. Based on the analysis of accessible sources, discussions, opinions, surveys and interviews some recommendations on the regulation of language use in higher education in Slovenia are provided.

Key words: higher education; internationalisation; language policy; Slovenian university policy.

Introduction

In the new millennium, European higher education has been most influenced by the Bologna Declaration (European higher education area, Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education, 1999). The primary aim of the declaration is to increase 'international competitiveness of the European higher education system' and establish a common European higher education area by 2010:¹

We hereby undertake to attain these objectives – within the framework of our institutional competences and taking full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages, national education systems and of University autonomy – to consolidate the European area of higher education. (p. 2)

The 2010 report of the European University Association (EUA) states that 46 countries have implemented the Bologna Declaration and that the highest percentage was achieved within the unified two-cycle structure while other areas remain organised differently. The 124-page document touches upon the question of languages, indicating that the reasons for a lower number of foreign students are poor language skills of the outgoing students and national language policies 'that limit teaching in non-national languages or require administering examinations in the national language' (Bologna Declaration, 1999, p. 80). It finds that internationalisation is the central strategy of the majority of the institutions and that one of its advantages is also the possibility of teaching in a foreign language (Bologna Declaration, 1999, p. 81). The appendix of the document includes a questionnaire that was used for the evaluation report and the questionnaire states that one of the means of enhancing the 'attractiveness' of an institution is also its offer of 'new courses in English or in another major European language' (Bologna Declaration, 1999, p. 107).

That is how in ten years' time the promise about the 'full respect of the diversity of cultures, languages ...' from the original document somewhat faded and the question of language policy of the European higher education area is now facing the same fate as the question of language policy in EU in general. As a result of the choice between multilingualism in theory and English as a lingua franca in practice, bipolar opinions clash over the hegemony of English and the rebellion against it on the one side, and pragmatic resignation to the reality of English *de facto* becoming the language of the united Europe on the other (i.e., Airey, 2004; Bjorkman, 2014; Brock-Utne, 2001, 2007; Gnutzmann, 2005; Hughes, 2008; Kalin Golob, 2001, 2010, 2012; Phillipson, 2003, 2006; Stabej, 2010a, 2010b, 2012; Stickel, 2010).

As noted by Phillipson (2006, p. 14), it is an oversimplification to introduce a false totalitarian dichotomy 'you are either with us or against us,'² meaning being either for or against English in language policy: 'English opens some doors and closes others.

¹ Overview of the progress and ministerial meetings at: <http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/building-the-european-higher-education-area/bologna-basics.aspx>

² Phillipson, however, quotes Bush's dichotomy: you are either with us or with the terrorists.

It can be used for good or bad reasons, with good or bad effects, but in the modern world it cannot be ignored.³

Language policy in Slovene higher education in post-Bologna Europe has been originally analysed in Kalin Golob et al. (2014).³ It seems that in Slovenia, too, the debaters cannot avoid constantly increasing the tension around the issue by going to two extremes: one being complete openness of language use (that would in the extreme case lead to English substituting Slovene as the predominant language of higher education) and the other a severe restriction even when an offer of subjects or courses in a foreign language would be necessary.

The aim of the article, which draws on our previous work, is to identify possibilities for productive development of the regulation of language use in Slovene higher education. Our foundation is the status of Slovene as the official language of the Republic of Slovenia (RS) and the primary language of the entire public education in the RS, but we acknowledge the need for a greater inclusion of foreign students and teachers and for a further enhancement of quality in higher education. Thus, the following chapters firstly present the legal framework and Slovene language policies, and secondly, the stakeholders' attitudes towards languages in higher education are introduced (drawing on the interviews and surveys). These are also analytically structured into three empirically existing patterns of how students and teachers understand the use of language in higher education (multivariate clustering approach was used):

- a) pro-Slovene
- b) pro-English
- c) cosmopolitan.

In the end, drawing on the theoretical background, previous research, analysis of the legislation and policies, as well as surveys and interviews, we offer recommendations on how to regulate language use in higher education in Slovenia:

- a) The goal of the language policy that we support and propose is to move towards a more cosmopolitan view.
- b) To be able to achieve such a shift of attitude, we put forward the following measures for consideration by decision-makers:
 - a) increased awareness of the importance of national language,
 - b) commitment by the State to provide a formal legal framework, and
 - c) development and operationalization of a language strategy as a responsibility of universities.

³ In the article we will present the analysis and the survey already published in Slovene language. Additionally, the results were analysed, depending on the viewpoint on language use in higher education, forming three opinion groups as they manifested themselves on the sample of students and university teachers of the University of Ljubljana.

Legal Framework and Language Policies

As in other EU member states, the language regulation of higher education in Slovenia derives from various provisions at different levels (Accetto, 2010, p. 25):

- Article 11 of the Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia defines Slovene as the official language, while in the areas of Italian and Hungarian national minority official languages are also Italian and Hungarian.
- The Act on Public Usage of Slovene Language⁴ in its article 12 defines that education from preschool to university level is imparted in Slovene language, while the use of other languages is permitted in accordance with sector specific regulations in the field of education. The same Act in article 13 promotes the learning of Slovene language in Slovenia. For that purpose the Government of the Republic of Slovenia has to adopt a programme that shall be 'in addition to the regular education programmes aimed at language improvement of youth and adult citizens, and programmes aimed at foreign nationals in Slovenia', as well as special programmes for the promotion of Slovene language at foreign education institutions.
- The sector specific Higher Education Act⁵ dedicates article 8 to the language of instruction, which is Slovene. However, higher education institutions may provide study programmes or parts of them in a foreign language under the conditions set by their statutes (meaning that foreign language study programmes, parts of study programmes where visiting professors from abroad take part, or a significant number of foreign students are enrolled therein, and study programmes that duplicate the programmes offered in Slovene can be taught in a foreign language). The Act also defines that higher education institutions 'ensure the development of Slovene as a professional or scientific language', that 'foreign citizens and Slovenes without Slovene citizenship should be enabled to learn Slovene', and that 'the minister responsible for higher education defines the detailed method of how to ensure the development and the learning of Slovene';
- In October 2013, a new draft of the Higher Education Act entered the public discussion, adding three new options for the implementation of study programmes in a foreign language (not only a part, but the entire study programme could be offered in a foreign language, if lectured by a visiting professor and⁶ when a substantial number of foreign students are enrolled; joint programmes can also be offered in a foreign language, as well as programmes of home education institutions offered abroad), however, the draft failed to resolve the current ambiguities and thus enables a continuation of non-transparent

⁴ The Act on Public Usage of Slovene, The Official Gazette of The Republic of Slovenia no.86/2004, p. 10114

⁵ Available at <http://www.uradni-list.si/1/objava.jsp?urlid=201232&stevilka=1406>

⁶ In the explanatory part of individual articles the bill (p.137) states that the two cumulative conditions are to be met.

programme and course implementation in a foreign language, on the account of Slovene as the language of higher education. Due to the change in government the bill proposed by the government failed to pass.

- The sectorial ministry prepared a proposal on 26 February 2016 to supplement article 8 by adding that study programmes can be imparted in a foreign language 'if the higher education institution also offers comparable study programmes or parts of them in the Slovene language'⁷, paragraph 5 defines more precisely the category of foreigners who are, together with the Slovenes without citizenship, enabled to learn Slovene language; these are higher education teachers, associates and students. By removing paragraph 6 from the Act, the concern for the development of the Slovene language has fallen entirely under the jurisdiction of higher education institutions, and the obligation of the competent minister to regulate this issue in a specific provision has been obliterated. In its opinion from 13 September 2016, the Legislative and legal service of the National Assembly declared, in conformity with the constitution and the legal system, that the wording on the comparability of programmes was undefined. In the aftermath of turbulent debates, which even increased the bipolar perspective on the language of higher education and failed to provide any constructive or professionally founded proposal, the suggested new Article 8 was withdrawn from the proposal. The law thus remains unchanged as far as the language of higher education is concerned.
- Slovene (public) higher education institutions have so far (despite various calls for it) failed to elaborate the guiding documents for language policy. In 2011, the University of Primorska prepared the first overview of language policy in line with the guidelines of the European Commission. The remaining two Slovene public universities have not yet prepared such documents; the University of Ljubljana has not yet formulated its language policy, despite explicit calls for systematic solutions to language problems since 2006, and the University of Maribor is also still in the process of document elaboration.

According to the strategies of Slovene universities, individual faculty strategies, the National Programme of Higher Education 2011–2020 and other documents, internationalisation has been among crucial factors of this decade. However, there have not been any/enough serious considerations and systemic solutions for the operationalization of the internationalisation strategy or for the regulation of the related question of language policy.

Initiatives by the linguistic profession, to deal with the question of higher education language transparently and systematically, have encountered various responses: from the opinions that view persistence on the legal diction of Slovene as the language

⁷ Act amending the Higher Education Act – proposal

of teaching in higher education as problematic and inhibiting internationalisation and the quality of higher education, to the proposals that faculties and universities should be free to decide their language of instruction, to explicit statements by high state officials⁸ that the quality of higher education can only be improved with foreign professors and English as the language of teaching. Ten years after the accreditation of the first Bologna study programmes in Slovenia, Slovene language policy in higher education still has not been elaborated and connected with the strategies of internationalisation or development of higher education in general.

The contrast between the legislation, the strategies of faculties/universities, and the national strategy is creating a situation that leads to the search for bypasses, which make the inclusion of foreign students possible. Due to a semi-legal improvisation, the solutions are partial, not well thought out, and without invested intellectual or financial resources. The results of the survey among foreign students reveal (Kalin Golob et al., 2014) that they mostly estimate their level of second foreign language knowledge as not good enough to study in it. This means it would be sensible to increase the offer of courses of Slovene language for foreign students and foreign language assistants. While the interest for courses of Slovene as a second language is high especially among regularly enrolled foreign students, the survey information indicate there is currently no considerable interest to study Slovene among exchange students. Even those who have learned Slovene do not have sufficient knowledge to fulfil their study obligations in Slovene.

Every further regulation of language questions in Slovene higher education should derive from the real needs for a quality internationalisation and respect of Slovene as the official language. However, the so far existing polarized opinions are reflected in an overprotective attitude to Slovene or in the total lack of consideration regarding the practical and symbolic aspects of language regulation, and we need to overcome them. The regulation has to be channelled into the “search for a correct balance between teaching in mother tongue and offering opportunities to develop foreign language skills, since they both represent the *sine qua non* for personal and professional development of individuals” (Bergan, 2001, p. 7).

That Slovene does not hinder a quality internationalisation is shown by the solutions of the National programme for language policy 2014–2018 (NPJP). They build on the assumption that “Slovene universities and the Republic of Slovenia wish to maintain and further develop Slovene as the language of higher education and the language of science, however, they also wish to provide international dimension of their operation as well as international competitiveness” (NPJP, p. 28). The programme thus defines (pp. 29–30):

- that the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport and universities, on the basis of the Higher Education Act (in the process of amending), the Resolution on

⁸ State secretary Dr. Dušan Lesjak from the Ministry of Higher Education in a radio broadcast Intelektla on July 18, 2006.

the national programme of higher education, and the strategies, should establish transparent modules for a sensible integration of foreign students and higher education teachers: (1) with quality parallel programmes and elective modules, specially formulated for exchange students, with courses that could be selected also by home students providing they meet the required conditions (in line with the next bullet point of measures); (2) by introducing the concept of differentiated multilingualism that follows the positive examples from abroad. According to this concept, the language of higher education is equal to the prevailing language of the environment, while simultaneous (machine generated) translation to another language, with instruments and means adapted to individual discipline, should be offered to students who do not master the language of higher education sufficiently. Transparencies and other study materials are generally bilingual, in the language of the environment and in a foreign language, while consultations with foreign students are also held in a foreign language; (3) by promoting student solidarity and tutorship or partnership between home and foreign students;

- legislation should define the compulsory majority proportion of higher education programmes offered in the Slovene language, instead of leaving it entirely up to the universities to define. Whereas the strategic orientation of universities and the state regarding the increase of mobility and exchange programmes coincide, the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport and higher education institutions should agree on the adequate method of financing;
- at the level of doctoral study universities are given full autonomy regarding their language policy, while taking into account the constitutional and legal restraints and the general principle that Slovene teachers should not lecture Slovene students in a foreign language.

This language resolution offers the possibility of including foreign students and teachers, as well as improving the quality of higher education with Slovene and parallel, or specifically developed foreign language subjects and courses. Above all, it preserves the role of Slovene as the language of higher education and science, which should be ensured by responsible national policies.

Methods

Data and Analysis

The empirical research was defined as a combination of electronic surveys formulated for three target groups (higher education teachers, home and foreign students), and in-depth interviews conducted with decision-makers of language policy in higher education (Rectors, Deans or Vice-Deans of selected faculties). In both of the cases we focused on three public universities: the University of Ljubljana, the University of Maribor, and the University of Primorska.

Surveys

The surveys were conducted in the first half of October 2012 and they consisted of three sections. In the first part the respondents were asked about the data that enabled us to divide them into different sociodemographic groups. Besides basic demographic data (gender and age), higher education teachers were also questioned about the university, faculty and programme where they teach, their pedagogical/teaching title, mother tongue and about the duration of their professional activity (in years). Students were questioned about the university, faculty and programme they were enrolled in, the level and the type of study, and their mother tongue.

The second part of the questionnaire for both groups, higher education teachers and students, comprised mainly factual questions, which served the purpose of checking the actual situation regarding the use of languages in Slovene higher education and of becoming familiar with the extent and the forms of the current implementation of courses and programmes in Slovene and in English or other foreign languages at Slovene universities. Students and teachers assessed their skills of listening comprehension, reading, talking, and writing in a foreign language. They assessed their own proficiency in English and in other European languages with the highest number of speakers, and they also had the option of adding other languages. In addition, they had to assess (on the scale from 0 to 5) the frequency of use of Slovene, English and other languages in various pedagogical or study activities (lectures, practical classes, seminars, consultations, written and oral exams, papers and other written assignments, study literature). In the following two questions, teachers were asked about their expectations regarding language proficiency of home and of foreign students, followed by the respondents' answers regarding their own length/period of pedagogical activities in a foreign language. In this part of the questionnaire students also stated the language they expect to use most in their future profession.

In the third part of the questionnaire, a five-level scale was used to assess the viewpoints of higher education teachers and students regarding the pedagogical process at Slovene universities conducted in English, and their consensus with the alleged advantages and weaknesses of higher education in Slovene and in English at Slovene universities.

There were 715 respondents to the survey for higher education teachers, of whom 469⁹ completed the survey. There were 2822 student respondents to the survey aimed at home students, with 2331¹⁰ students completing it, and 283 foreign student respondents, of which the survey was completed by 236.

⁹ We thus managed to include 8% of the higher education teachers at Slovene public universities.

¹⁰ Also in this case we included a sample of 8% of the students enrolled in university higher education study programmes at Slovene public universities.

Interviews

In-depth interviews conducted with the representatives of faculty administration consisted of two parts. The first part was aimed at gathering exact information about the implementation of study programmes for exchange students at the faculties under their administration, and in the second part we inquired about their view on the use of Slovene, English and other foreign languages in Slovene higher education, as well as their position regarding the proposals for the regulation of this question at the level of faculty, university and state.

In-depth interviews were conducted with the rectors of the University of Ljubljana and the University of Maribor, and with the deans of the following member faculties at the University of Ljubljana: the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Social Sciences, the Biotechnical Faculty, and the Faculty of Education, and we had a transcript of interviews with the administration of the Faculty of Economics from a previous research. At the University of Maribor the interviews were conducted with the deans of the Faculty of Economics and Business, the Faculty of Arts, the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. At the University of Primorska the vice-dean for international relations at the Faculty of Humanities responded to our invitation.

Results

Stakeholders' Attitudes towards Languages in Higher Education

For the needs of the present article the key findings of the research are summed up, while a comprehensive description of the summary survey statistics and transcribed interviews with decision-makers can be accessed in the monograph *Language Policy and Languages of Higher Education in Slovenia* (Kalin Golob et al., 2014).

The results of our research conducted among the staff, students and decision-makers in higher education show that the use of English as the language of instruction – with the exception of the study materials in English – is currently mostly limited to the education of foreign students. Approximately three quarters of Slovene students fulfil almost all their study obligations in Slovene, and more than half of the respondents among higher education teachers have never lectured in English. Students and higher education teachers, as well as the administration of the faculties, perceive English as an additional language of instruction that higher education institutions are obliged to provide, in order to achieve the goal of international integration set by internationalisation, but is primarily not used for communication with home students.

Key Points from the Interviews

Interviews with decision-makers from selected faculties reveal that the organization of study activities in English (for foreign students) is in general the responsibility of the faculties or even of departments within faculties. It is mostly left to the initiative of individual teachers, as it is not systematically thought out and planned at the level of universities or the State. Moreover, it does not have any additional financial support,

which was pointed out as the key problem by almost every interviewed decision-maker.

Consequently, as decision-makers pointed out in their responses, the diversity and the quantity of study contents at Slovene faculties, which are delivered in English, is often insufficient. Decision-makers expose the inability to actually include foreign students in the study process and thus the absence of their interactions with Slovene peers, which is supposed to be one of the main goals of student exchanges as one side of the problem, while on the other side, lecturers deliver courses in foreign language practically voluntarily and in their spare time. The implementation of internationalisation, a national goal written in fundamental development documents, is therefore in fact often left to the decisions of individual higher education teachers and is based solely on their sense of responsibility towards their students.

Decision-makers from the faculties where foreign language students are treated mostly through consultations and more individualized work point out that the currently provided solutions will only suffice as long as the number of foreign students is relatively low. An increase in the number of foreign students that universities include in their medium-term development plans would require a significant change. On the other hand, it is precisely the limited number of foreign students and their dispersion in different courses that represent an obstacle to delivering courses in a foreign language from the point of view of faculty administrations. Slovene students at two of the faculties included in the research partly contributed to this situation by refusing to attend lectures delivered by Slovene higher education teachers in English, just because there were a few foreign students in the lecture hall. That this was a matter of principle rather than incompetence to study in English or insufficient preparation of Slovene lecturers for delivering a subject in English can be concluded from the positive self-evaluation of English skills of Slovene students and lecturers, as well as from the lecturers' evaluation of students' English language competence, and the students' evaluation of teachers' competence to teach in English.

None of the faculties examines the teachers' ability to deliver lectures in English – their habilitation is considered a sufficient evidence of their linguistic competence. Neither do they provide linguistic training, so the care for their own linguistic competence in their first and other languages is left to the initiative of individuals. Training in multilingual academic discourse for students and teachers is currently planned only in the internationalisation guidelines of the University of Primorska. The situation is different with students. Most of the selected faculties organize language education for students at the institutional level – Slovene students improve their level of high-school English at least in the first two years by following compulsory subjects of English for special purposes, where they also familiarize themselves with English terminology of their profession.

Understanding internationalisation as a lever to improve the position of Slovene faculties in international quality rankings and increase the possibility of ensuring

additional financial means was significantly more pronounced among members of faculty administration (deans and vice-deans) than in other groups of stakeholders. Decision-makers holding such a viewpoint on internationalisation typically also believe the following: education is an industry or so to say a profitable branch, and the current legal regulation on language use in higher education is rigid and thus hinders the development of Slovene universities. It is also characteristic of these faculty administrations that they are more favourable to delivering a part of the study obligations in English also for domestic students because they see it as an advantage that will put the students into a better position in the labour market. The students' wish to study in Slovene was in that context interpreted as an attempt to take the easy way out, typical especially for less successful and less motivated students.

The decision-makers of other faculties are more cautious about internationalisation as the solution to all the problems of Slovene universities, and they emphasize that delivering courses in English is a necessary but not sufficient condition for attracting foreign students and lecturers. A high percentage of contents in English that is supposed to attract foreign students and thus partially compensate for the "brain drain" of domestic students could in fact be one of the reasons contributing to the decision of Slovene students to study abroad (if the contents are delivered in English at home and abroad).

At the same time, it can be seen that delivering contents in English is not necessarily a solution for overcoming language barriers. Virtually all the decision-makers reported that foreign students – especially from certain groups of European countries – have such difficulties in the use of English that teaching in English could present an obstacle to successful learning. Especially the interviewed decision-makers from the faculties of humanities of all three universities pointed out that the internationalisation process is far from being fully understood if we equate it with the implementation of English as a language of instruction. Internationalisation should in principle lead to multilingualism and multiculturalism and not to substitution of national languages with lingua franca. In their opinion, Slovene higher education could make better use of internationalisation by opening up to neighbouring countries.

Faculty administrations are quite well informed about the efficiency and the problems of providing contents for foreign students in the manner currently present at their faculties. They estimate that a combination of current legal and financial framework enables only this system and thus they refrain from contemplating any possible changes and improvements. Suggestions for regulating language use in higher education provided by the interviewed faculty decision-makers were all very general. It became clear that most of those who agreed with the need for legal regulation of this issue also did not find it necessary to change the current legal framework. In their opinion, it would make sense to start taking advantage of the opportunities the law already offers and gain enough practical experience in offering studies in a foreign language, which could be used for demonstrating the need for changes. The second

line of thought emphasizes the need for deregulation, which is supposed to give universities a competitive edge on the international market. The suggested systematic regulation at the university level is partly connected with the estimate (more or less off the top of their heads) of how and how much each faculty should increase the percentage of contents offered in English. And, since nobody finds it feasible to offer a comprehensive parallel study programme in Slovene and English, the question that arises is how much and which part of the contents should be delivered in English for domestic students. The third line of thought views the quality and attractiveness of the courses offered in English as centrepiece, and starts from the belief that it would be easier to offer courses of this type if it was the university to coordinate their creation. Programmes primarily designed according to the needs and interests of foreign students, but open also to domestic students, would therefore not interfere with the regular study process at Slovene universities, which would continue to be delivered in Slovene.

Key Points from the Surveys

The results of the survey among domestic and foreign students show that they mostly estimate their level of foreign language knowledge as not sufficient for studying. Thus, it would be sensible to increase the offer of Slovene language courses for foreign students and foreign language assistants, as well as the number of English and other foreign language courses for Slovene students and teachers. Currently, they are carried out for all university members by the Language Centre of the Faculty of Arts, and should be made as inexpensive as possible or if possible free of charge.

While the interest for courses of Slovene as a second language is high, especially among full time foreign students, according to the survey, there seems to be no considerable interest among exchange students to study Slovene. Additionally, even those who have learned Slovene do not agree that they have sufficient knowledge to fulfil their study obligations in Slovene.

The interpretation of studying in English as having added value in itself does not correspond to the viewpoints expressed by domestic students and teachers in the survey. On average, they do not assign any special benefits to studying in English as compared to studying in Slovene. The only exception is 'for better possibilities of studying abroad'.

Regarding the attitudes of students, the most important results are as follows: students are, on average, very principled and firmly united in supporting Slovene as the key and prevailing language of Slovene higher education - especially at the undergraduate level. They are directly supportive of the language policy that strives to preserve the current situation also in the future, and thus ensure that the national language is fully functional, rejecting the pragmatic and market-oriented education, which leads to the predominance of English. Students therefore perceive Slovene as a value and certainly not as an obstacle to the globalisation of education, or as

the logical choice only in the private sphere. Yet, despite their universal support for Slovene they do not deny the necessity of multilingualism and the use of English in an interconnected world and their affection for Slovene does not go to extremes, since they (although weakly) reject the generalist and radical language protectionism. They are divided when it comes to direct comparisons of quality and advantages of studying in Slovene or in English. They also only mildly agree with the most frequent publicly used argument for studying in English, i.e. the advantage in education and career abroad.

As we understand the above results, students assessed the statements about language use in higher education from two separate perspectives; on the one hand expressively from their own perspective and considering only the consequences and effects of the use of a certain language of instruction that directly affect them. On the other hand, when providing their position on statements describing the state with which they have no direct experience, they based their answers in a more abstract framework of principles and values regarding the significance of a certain language and its use or perhaps they expressed their (dis)-agreement mostly ad hoc and not founded in the previously well-formed opinion. Therefore, the students' opinions on language use in higher education reflect two different patterns (based on personal experiences and based on abstract principles). Moreover, their answers are in a way very similar to those offered by the deans and rectors – their points of view are clear at the most principled, abstract level, but as questions become more concrete, their viewpoints become less clear.

We believe that the key aspect of answers provided by the students is that they see the use of their first language as self-evident in all communication domains in general. The findings stand for undergraduate and postgraduate students equally, since the average and the distribution of the answers are the same regardless of the level of studies.

Typology of Attitudes to Language among Students and Teachers of the University of Ljubljana

After considering the general image of language use issues at Slovene universities, we examined the similarities and differences among individuals and established the typical patterns of understanding the role of languages in higher education and thus developed a typology of attitudes to language. In other words, we divided students and teachers from the University of Ljubljana who participated in the survey into groups according to their viewpoints, in order to form cohesive groups with as similar viewpoints as possible, while the groups were supposed to be as different as possible. The number of groups was not determined beforehand, and the size of the smallest group was not limited. With a view to the nature of the problem (data are the viewpoints) and to the measurement level of data (the interval scale), firstly a combination of Ward's hierarchical clustering method and Euclidean distance

(Johnson & Wichern, 1992, pp. 573–602) was selected, and secondly, K-means method (Johnson & Wichern, 1992, pp. 573–602) was applied in the final part of the proceedings. In both methods the best option turned out to be the division of respondents (students and teachers respectively) into three groups. The results of clustering the two subsamples into three groups obtained with the two methods are consistent, which implies that the solution is stable.

The analysis revealed the same three patterns of thinking about the problem of language use in both subsamples (students and teachers). We named them pro-Slovene, pro-English and Cosmopolitan. These are three typical and prevailing patterns that are characteristically present in tackling this question in various Slovene and European political organs and branches associated with higher education and linguistics, as well as in the journalistic discourse and wider social discussions on this topic, and were thus predictable and expected. The added value of the segmentation is in estimating the size (importance) of each group and the exact position of each group on various issues.

We continue with a more detailed presentation of the three groups of students with different attitudes to the above-mentioned questions. In Table 1 below the averages by group can be seen, obtained with K-means method, substituted with the meaning of averages relative to the overall average or the obtained general picture of the attitude to the language. If a group differentiates from the overall average not only at the level of agreement or disagreement, but also on the other side of the scale of measurement (e.g. overall average implies agreement, while the group average implies disagreement), the meaning of the average is added in the cell. If this is not the case, only the level and direction of differentiation are described, and if there is no differentiation, the cell is empty.

Table 1

Averages by group

	Cosmopolitan	Pro-English	Pro-Slovene	All
It is important for me to master the Slovene for specific purposes (LSP) relevant for my study discipline. (S1)		Less agreement		Very strong agreement
It is important for me to master the English for specific purposes (LSP) relevant for my study discipline. (S2)	More agreement	More agreement	Much less agreement	Strong agreement
Slovene universities should offer higher education courses for home students at the bachelor level of studies in Slovene, except for the guest lectures of foreign lecturers. (S3)	More agreement	Much less agreement = they slightly disagree	Much more agreement	Agreement

	Cosmopolitan	Pro-English	Pro-Slovene	All
Slovene universities should offer higher education courses for home students at the master and doctorate level of studies in Slovene, except for the guest lectures of foreign lecturers. (S4)	More agreement	Much less agreement = they do not agree	Much more agreement	Weak agreement
Home students at Slovene universities who attend university courses in English have better chances for a career abroad. (S5)	More agreement	More agreement	Much less agreement = they are neutral	Weak agreement
Study programmes in English at Slovene universities do not present any advantage compared to the ones in Slovene. (S6)		Much less agreement = they slightly disagree	Much more agreement = they agree	Neutral
I would complete my studies with equal quality if they were in English. (S7)	More agreement = slightly agree	Much more agreement = they agree	Much more disagreement – they do not agree	Neutral
Slovene universities should offer higher education courses for foreign students in Slovene. (S8)	Slightly more disagreement	More disagreement	Much more agreement = they are neutral	Weak disagreement
It would be good if higher education pedagogical process in Slovenia was (in the future) implemented in English. (S9)		Much less disagreement = neutral	Much more disagreement	Disagreement
Pedagogical work at Slovene universities should always be conducted in English. (S10)		Much less disagreement = almost neutral	Much more disagreement	Strong disagreement
Number of students per group	411	313	436	

Pro-English Oriented Group of Students

The group that deviates from the overall average of students most is the pro-English group, which is also the smallest and comprises about a quarter of students. The attitudes of this group of students to the use of languages in Slovene higher education differentiate from the overall average in: the disagreement with the statement that teaching of home students at the bachelor level of studies (S3) and at the master level of studies (S4) at Slovene universities should be conducted in Slovene, except for the guest lectures by foreign lecturers (students on average agree with this statement); the agreement with the idea that it would be good if higher education teaching was (in the future) conducted in English (S9; on average students disagree with this); as in the agreement with the statement they would complete their studies with equal quality, were they conducted in English (S7); and in the disagreement with the statement that study in English at Slovene universities does not bring any advantages compared to the one in Slovene (S6; students were on average neutral). At the same time, students

in this group were almost neutral regarding the demand that the pedagogical process at Slovene universities should always be imparted in English (S10: this is the biggest objection on average). They strongly reject the idea of study programmes in Slovene also for foreign students (S8), fewer than average agree with the statement that mastering Slovene for specific purposes is important (S1), and more agree with the statement that proficiency in English for specific purposes is important (S2), and that study in English prepares them better for a career abroad (S5).

By combining the answers, we can establish a pattern of thinking, where instead of symbolic, a practical and pragmatic dimension of the use of languages in higher education is at the forefront. In this group, the increased use of English, as an indispensable consequence of internationalisation, is not perceived as problematic. In direct comparison, the group prioritizes study programmes in English, and in contrast with the findings of cognitive and sociolinguistic discipline rejects the presumption that study programmes offered in a native language are of better quality. In line with the overall average, but more markedly, they stress the importance of multilingualism and readiness to study in English. As expected, on the basis of their preference for English as the language of teaching, they oppose the idea of language protectionism, namely the idea of imparting study programmes in Slovene also for foreign students. They value the importance of mastering Slovene for specific purposes less than the average, and they are on average less inclined to Slovene and strongly support the use of English.

Moreover, this group corresponds to the profile of a student typical of development documents projections, where most of the mentioned reform proposals can be found. The group members are characterized by ambitions, greater flexibility, and better adaptation to current circumstances, which is also connected with an above-average proficiency in English. Further analyses have shown that this group assesses their English proficiency the highest in all dimensions. They use English most frequently, they value the importance and quality of English professional literature most, they agree most with the statement that they have a better understanding of professional terminology in English than in Slovene, understand study materials in English best, and agree more with the statement that Matura level of English suffices for the study/understanding of professional terminology in English. Their understanding of complex questions of language use is based on a clearly defined personal perspective, focused on the individual and his/her career goals. Thus, they understand the language mostly as a tool of communication and a means for efficient achievement of goals, while neglecting its social-symbolic dimension and disregarding the potential socio-political changes connected with the disuse of Slovene, or perhaps do not consider these changes as problematic.

Pro-Slovene Oriented Group of Students

The group that deviates significantly from the overall picture of respondents is the pro-Slovene oriented group, which is in stark contrast with the previously described

one. This is also the biggest group, encompassing more than a third of all students. It deviates from the average values in particular: in its neutral attitude to the statement that foreign students should also study in Slovene (S8; students on average oppose this idea); respondents are neutral to the statement that Slovene students, who study in English, are better prepared for a career abroad (S5; on average students agree with this statement); they clearly agree with the statement that study in English offers no advantages compared to that in Slovene (S6); and disagree with the statement that they would complete their studies with equal quality were they conducted in English (S7; in both statements students are on average neutral). This group is also more inclined to using Slovene at both levels of study (S3 and S4), they agree less with the importance of mastering English for special purposes (S2) and with the claim that introducing English as the language of teaching is either useful or should be compulsory (S9 and S10; in both statements the disagreement is complete, declaratory and unanimous).

By combining the group characteristics, we observe a pattern which gives explicit priority to Slovene, when the quality and usefulness of study in English or Slovene are directly compared. It does not support the arguments in favour of studying in English; it confirms the hypothesis of cognitive primacy of mother tongue and thus a better quality of education in the national language. It is neutral to language protectionism, and attributes less importance to mastering English for specific purposes. In more than average, it rejects the pragmatic and market oriented understanding of university and the perception of Slovene as an obstacle to the quality of internationalisation, and the respondents also value the use of Slovene at both levels of study higher than the average. In general, we can speak about a pattern of explicit preference for Slovene, which supports the use of English in Slovene higher education only at the most abstract level of principles, while in defining the concrete options of implementation it becomes clear that English is actually rejected.

Further analyses have revealed that this group's assessment of all the dimensions of communication skills in English is the lowest, they object most to the claim that they have a better understanding of English for specific purposes than Slovene, agree least with the statement that Matura knowledge of English suffices for the understanding of professional terminology, and are least confident in understanding the study materials in English. All of the above indicates that this group promotes Slovene not only because of the principles and the value of Slovene, but is also motivated by pragmatic assessment of the respondents' own inability to study in a foreign language, in particular in English. This group consists of proportionally fewer second level Bologna study programmes and of more undergraduates from the old study programmes. They rarely use English in their study related activities in general, and value the quality and importance of foreign study literature the least of all. In comparison with other groups, a much higher proportion of this group's members expect to use Slovene at work.

Multilingually Oriented Group of Students (Cosmopolitans)

This is the group that deviates the least from the overall average, however, it still does. As far as its size is concerned, it falls between the two previously described groups: it comprises over a third of students (its size being nearly the same as that of the previous group). It significantly deviates from the average only in the statement: they could complete the study with equal quality, were it conducted in English (S7; on average, the students are neutral). With a view to all other statements, we can speak more about the levels of agreeing or disagreeing. This group emphasizes the importance of mastering English for specific purposes (S2; the most of all groups), and it agrees with better options for a career abroad for students who study at home but in English (S5), however, the group members also value the use of Slovene at both levels of study more than others (S3 and S4), which seems to be in contrast with the previous statements. They reject the viewpoint that foreign students should also study in Slovene at Slovene universities somewhat more than others (S8).

If we combine the viewpoints, we can identify a pattern in which multilingualism and interculturalism are valued higher than individual languages, and where the acknowledgment of symbolic and communicative or pragmatic dimension of Slovene and English are balanced out. Support for the use of Slovene as the prevailing language of teaching at all levels of study is high; however, it is balanced with the awareness regarding the advantages of communication in English. Therefore, this is the group that, based on the assessment of their cognitive ability to study in English, rejects the thesis of a better quality of education, if imparted in the mother tongue, and is generally moderate in dealing with this topic. It does not support protectionism or primacy of an individual language, but advocates highly functional language skills in both languages and their sensible combination. Respondents from this group demonstrate flexibility and readiness for a potential internationalisation related increased scope of study obligations in English, and they assess their skills in English as slightly better than average, similar to the pro-English oriented group. They assess their level of English knowledge as higher in all dimensions, as well as the importance of English professional literature, they understand the literature and study materials in English better, and they agree with the statement that Matura knowledge of English suffices for the understanding of English professional literature. However, their attitude to the languages, in contrast with the pro-English oriented group, is balanced and they recognize the importance of multilingualism and interculturalism. Students from this group emphasize the importance of a fully functional Slovene and reject the market oriented and pragmatic logic of introducing English at the expense of Slovene, which is perceived as an obstacle to the internationalisation of higher education. Furthermore, they do not opt for either of the languages when benefits of studying in English and Slovene are compared directly. This is also a typical view of students at the University of Ljubljana.

Students and Teachers – Generalisation of Results

The three groups of teachers do not differ from the students (neither in attitudes nor in size), however, the orientation of their views is slightly more pronounced than in the students' groups (Kalin Golob et al., 2014). We can thus sum up the final conclusions valid for both groups of stakeholders.

The pro-Slovene group of students and teachers (the largest group), although declaratively aware of the inevitability and importance of mastering English in the context of the modern European higher education, expresses strong preference for the use of Slovene in all their viewpoints on the role of languages of instruction in Slovene higher education. However, in the results of their English skills self-evaluation, the score was the lowest in this group, which can lead us to think that their favouritism towards Slovene is not based solely on their awareness of the symbolic role of languages, their understanding of Slovene as a value, and their belief in the cognitive primacy of the mother tongue, but that it is at least partially linked also to their feeling of insufficient competence for studying or delivering higher education courses in English.

On the contrary, the pro-English group of students and teachers (the smallest group) does not problematize and support the increased use of English as the (inevitable) consequence of internationalisation of higher education, referring to better educational and professional opportunities allegedly connected with studying in English and relying on their above-average proficiency in English.

The viewpoints of the cosmopolitan group (medium sized group) are the closest to those that serve as the basis for European and Slovene language policies and for the National Programme 2014–2018. This group of students and lecturers does not strive for the primacy of one of the two languages, but rather for a high proficiency in both languages and for a sensible combination of both.

Conclusions

Recommendations for Language Policy in Higher Education in Slovenia

The research findings indicate a complexity of modern issues of higher education where universal declarative endeavours for internationalisation and an ever-higher quality are not based on key considerations of the significance of notions and measures required for their assurance. A consideration that has never been entirely and systematically carried out is also the question of language in higher education.

This question is, on the one hand, connected to the national language policy and, on the other hand, to the national policy on higher education and the policy on education and research, while it is indirectly regulated by legal norms in other fields. It is vital to take this into consideration when addressing this question, otherwise the solutions can be partial or even contradictory.

On the basis of theoretical starting points, comparable research and conducted surveys and interviews we can confirm that:

- according to student respondents, the use of mother tongues is important for the quality of the study
- for a fully functional Slovene as a standardized language, its use in science and at university is essential
- internationalisation enriches the education process and contributes to its quality
- in Slovenia laws and strategic documents are not harmonized, which leads to improvisation in the promotion of internationalisation
- internationalisation in the conditions of inadequate financial resources does not encourage quality
- in absence of a legal, professional, financial and strategic framework, the implementation of internationalisation is left to the faculties or even individuals, who decide on the basis of current circumstances and their own understanding of internationalisation
- this understanding of internationalisation is reflected in three established types of attitudes to language, namely: prevailing pro-Slovene, a slightly weaker cosmopolitan, and a weaker pro-English attitude
- the goal of the language policy we support and propose is to move towards a more cosmopolitan view.

To be able to achieve such a shift of attitude, we put forward the following measures for consideration by the decision-makers:

- normalization of language awareness,
- assurance of formal legal framework as a responsibility of the country,
- and development and operationalization of a language strategy as a responsibility of universities.

The status of Slovene and other languages in Slovene higher education must be formally and legally regulated in a way that assures development of Slovene and a high-quality internationalisation, while also enabling a flexible adaptation to new possibilities and needs.

However, a legal provision in itself does not suffice for a truly constructive language planning. The responsible ministry should therefore provide a language-planning framework, which could be used by higher education institutions as a starting point for the introduction of language regulations adjusted to them and for their inclusion in the respective statutes.

The responsible ministry should encourage the establishment of a language-planning framework and good language practices (for Slovene and for foreign languages) with special financial instruments. This implies defined standards of excellence in language practice that would be well thought out and based on expert opinion.

A responsible language policy has an important role in preserving full functionality of the Slovene language and ensuring quality and specificity of Slovene national higher

education. Only with a fully functional national language can Slovene politics and society contribute to the realization of European higher education area, since it, like the idea of European Union, exists only on the foundations of linguistic and cultural diversity.

References

- A Judicious Use of English in Higher Education. (2011). *Report summary*. Onderwijsraad. Retrieved from <http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/a-judicious-use-of-english.pdf>
- Accetto, M. (2010). Nacionalni jeziki, visoko šolstvo in mobilnost v pravu EU. In M. Humar, & M. Žagar Karer (Eds.), *Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu*. [National languages in higher education: collected papers from the International Conference Language Diversity and National Languages in Higher Education] (pp. 23-35). Ljubljana: Založba SAZU.
- Airey, J. (2004). Can you teach it in English? Aspects of the language choice debate in Swedish higher education. Conference *Language and the future of Europe: ideologies, policies and practices*, Southampton, July 8–10, 2004. Retrieved from <http://www2.hik.se/dokument/.%5Chumsam%5Cengelska%5Cjaresearch/langchoice.pdf>
- Bergan, S. (2001). *Language policies in higher education – Introduction to a debate*. A result of a round table debate of the Council of Europe's Higher Education and Research Committee in October 2001. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/.../language_EN.asp
- Björkman, B. (2014). Language ideology or language practice? An analysis of language policy documents at Swedish universities. *Multilingua*, 33(3–4), 335–363. <https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0016>
- Bolonjska deklaracija [Bologna Declaration]. (1999). *Evropski visokošolski prostor, Skupna deklaracija evropskih ministrov za izobraževanje* [European higher education area, Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education], zbranih v Bologni 19. junija 1999. Retrieved from http://www.arhiv.mvzt.gov.si/fileadmin/mvzt.gov.si/pageuploads/doc/dokumenti_visokosolstvo/Bolonjski_proces/Bolonjska_deklaracija_slo.pdf
- Brock-Utne, B. (2001). The growth of English for academic communication in the Nordic Countries. *International Review of Education*, 47, 221–233. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1017941523866>
- Brock-Utne, B. (2007). Language of Instructions and Research in Higher Education in Europe: highlights from the current debate in Norway and Sweden. *International Review of Education*, 53, 367–388. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-007-9051-2>
- Bull, T. (2012). Against the mainstream: universities with an alternative language policy. *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 216, 55–73. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2012-0039>

- Coleman, J. A. (2006). English-medium teaching in European Higher Education. *Language Teaching*, 39, 1, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480600320X>
- Gâz, R. (2011). Language Policies in European Higher Education Area. Babeş – bolyai University – a case study. *Romanian review of international studies*, III(1), 51–70.
- Gnutzmann, C. (2005). *The Triumph of English: A Case of Linguistic Neo-Colonisation*. Retrieved from www.aca-secretariat.be/08events/Language%20Policies.htm
- Hughes, R. (2008). Internationalisation of Higher Education and Language Policy: Questions of Quality and Equity. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 20(1), 112–127. <https://doi.org/10.1787/hemp-v20-art6-en>
- Johnson, R. A., & Wichern, D. W. (1992). *Applied Multivariate Statistical Analysis: IV/12 Clustering*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Kalin Golob, M. (2001). Jezikovnokulturni vidiki vključevanja Slovenije v Evropsko unijo [The Language-Cultural Aspects of Slovenian way to EU]. *Teorija in praksa*, 38(2), 213–230.
- Kalin Golob, M. (2010). Univerza, veš svoj dolg. In M. Humar, & M. Žagar Karer (Eds.), *Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu: zbornik prispevkov z Mednarodne konference Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu [National languages in higher education: collection of papers, presented at the International conference on diversity and national languages in higher education]* (pp. 111–117). Ljubljana: Založba SAZU.
- Kalin Golob, M. (2012). Jezik slovenskega visokega šolstva: med zakonodajo, strategijo in vizijo. In V. Gorjanc (Ed.), *Slovanski jeziki. Iz preteklosti v prihodnost [Slavic languages. From the past to the Future]* (pp. 95–105). Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.
- Kalin Golob, M., Stabej, M., Stritar Kučuk, M., Červ, G., & Kropivnik, S. (2014). *Jezikovna politika in jeziki visokega šolstva v Sloveniji*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Stabej, M. (2010a). *V družbi z jezikom [In community with language]*. Ljubljana: Trojina.
- Stabej, M. (2010b). Več jezikov – več vprašanj. In M. Ivšek (Ed.), *Pot k jezikovni politiki v izobraževanju* (pp. 60–77). Ljubljana: Zavod Republike Slovenije za šolstvo.
- Stabej, M. (2012). Jezik, nazori in nadzor. In A. Bjelčevič (Ed.), *Ideologije v slovenskem jeziku, literaturi in kulturi*. Zbornik predavanj 48. SSJLK. (pp. 11–20). Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete.
- Stickel, G. (2010). Domain loss of a language and its short- and long-term consequences. In Ljubljana: Založba SAZU. In M. Humar, & M. Žagar Karer (Eds.), *Nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu: zbornik prispevkov z Mednarodne konference Jezikovna različnost in nacionalni jeziki v visokem šolstvu [National languages in higher education: collection of papers, presented at the International conference on diversity and national languages in higher education]* (pp. 13–22). Ljubljana: Založba SAZU.

Monika Kalin Golob

Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva pl. 5, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
monika.kalin-golob@fdv.uni-lj.si

Gaja Červ

Waldorf School of Ljubljana
Streliška ul. 12, SI1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
gaja.cerv@waldorf.si

Marko Stabej

Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana
Aškerčeva 2, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
marko.stabej@ff.uni-lj.si

Mojca Stritar Kučuk

Petkova 60, 1231 Ljubljana, Slovenia
mojca.stritar@gmail.com

Samo Kropivnik

Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana
Kardeljeva pl. 5, SI1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia
samo.kropivnik@fdv.uni-lj.si

Appendix:

Survey for Slovene students

Q1

Which is the university you are studying at?

- 1 (University of Ljubljana)
- 2 (University of Maribor)
- 3 (University of Primorska)
- 4 (other)

Q2

At which faculty?

Q3

Which study programme are you enrolled in?

Q4

Select your study model.

- 1 (first level (Bologna))
- 2 (second level (Bologna))
- 3 (third level (Bologna))
- 4 (undergraduate (non-Bologna))
- 5 (master level (non-Bologna))
- 6 (doctoral level (non-Bologna))
- 7 (other)

Q5

Select your status.

- 1 (regular student)
- 2 (part time student)
- 3 (other)

Q6

Which is your mother tongue?

- Slovene
- Italian
- Hungarian
- Croatian/Serbian/Bosnian
- Macedonian
- Albanian
- other:

Q7

Provide an assessment of your skills in reading, writing, listening, and speaking for individual foreign language on the scale from 0 to 3 (0 – not at all, 1 – a little, 2 – medium, 3 – fluent)

Q8

Provide an assessment of how often you use Slovene language in the following study activities (1 – never, 5 – always)

Lectures

Handouts

Exams

Papers and other study obligations in writing

Paper presentations and other oral presentations

Study of professional literature

Consultations

Q9

Provide an assessment of how often you use English language in the following study activities (1 - never, 5 – always)

Lectures

Handouts

Exams

Papers and other study obligations in writing

Paper presentations and other oral presentations

Study of professional literature

Consultations

Q10

Provide an assessment of how often you use a different language – not English - in the following study activities (1 - never, 5 – always)

Lectures

Handouts

Exams

Papers and other study obligations in writing

Paper presentations and other oral presentations

Study of professional literature

Consultations

Q11

After graduation I expect to use mostly the following language in the exercise of my profession

1 (Slovene)

2 (English)

3 (other:)

Q12

Is your study programme conducted in the language that was announced in the tender?

1 (Yes)

2 (No)

Q13

Mark each of the below given statements on the scale from 1 to 5 (1 – I completely disagree, 5 – I completely agree)

- ☐ Slovene universities should offer higher education for foreign students in a foreign language.
- ☐ I would complete my study programme with equal quality if it was in English.
- ☐ Teaching/pedagogical activities at Slovene universities should always be conducted in English.
- ☐ Knowledge verification should be conducted in the language of teaching.
- ☐ Higher education teachers are proficient in the languages of teaching.
- ☐ Higher education classes at Slovene universities should be conducted in Slovene also for foreign students.
- ☐ Study in English language at Slovene universities provides no benefits in comparison to the study in Slovene language.
- ☐ Apart from the lectures by foreign guest lecturers, all other classes for home students at the first level of study at Slovene universities should be conducted in Slovene.
- ☐ Higher education classes at the second and third level of study for home students should be conducted in Slovene, apart from the lectures delivered by foreign guest lecturers.
- ☐ It would be good if higher education pedagogical process in Slovenia was in the future implemented in English language.

Q14

For each of the statements below mark your agreement/disagreement on the scale from 1 to 5 (1 – I completely disagree, 5 – I completely agree)

- ☐ It is important for me to master Slovene language for specific purposes from my study discipline.
- ☐ Professional foreign language literature for my study discipline is of a higher quality compared to the Slovene literature.
- ☐ It is easier for me to understand English than Slovene professional terminology from my study discipline.
- ☐ Matura level of English knowledge allows me to study professional literature in a foreign language.

Q15

For each of the statements below mark your agreement/disagreement on the scale from 1 to 5 (1 – I completely disagree, 5 – I completely agree)

- ☐ Home students who take courses at Slovene universities in Slovene language are more successful in their studies.
- ☐ Home students who take courses at Slovene universities in English language have better chances for a career abroad.
- ☐ Students who take courses at Slovene universities in English language are more successful in the exercise of their profession.
- ☐ Home students who take courses at Slovene universities in Slovene language master more study material compared to the students who take courses in English language.
- ☐ Students who take courses at Slovene universities in English language find it easier to keep up with professional developments and novelties.
- ☐ Home students who take courses at Slovene universities in Slovene language are more at ease when communicating during their course/study activities.
- ☐ Home students who take courses at Slovene universities in English language have difficulties with professional terminology in Slovene language.
- ☐ I have no problems understanding the delivered study contents and literature in English.
- ☐ Study conducted in English language at Slovene universities is easier than the one conducted in Slovene language.

Q16

Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the topic dealt with, or let us know your opinion on the survey?

Hoće li preživjeti? Nacionalni jezik i internacionalizacija visokoga obrazovanja u Sloveniji

Sažetak

„Nedoumice“ između višejezičnosti u teoriji i engleskoga kao *lingue francae* u praksi tiču se poslijebolonjskoga europskoga visokog obrazovanja u cjelini. Ovaj rad prikazuje primjer Slovenije putem analize sličnih izazova prisutnih u slovenskoj (visokoobrazovnoj) jezičnoj politici. Stanje se stvari sagledava s aspekta prihvatanja statusa slovenskoga jezika kao službenoga jezika Republike Slovenije, kao i prihvatanja potrebe za većom uključenosti stranih studenata i nastavnika i daljnjeg unapređenja kvalitete visokoga obrazovanja. U radu se predstavljaju rezultati ispitivanja koja su provedena u listopadu 2012. godine među najvažnijim dionicima slovenskoga visokog obrazovanja s ciljem istraživanja stajališta o uporabi jezika poučavanja u visokome obrazovanju. Rezultati su analizirani s pogledom na izraženo stajalište u vezi s uporabom jezika u visokome obrazovanju, što je dovelo do uspostavljanja triju skupina mišljenja unutar uzorka studenata i nastavnika Sveučilišta u Ljubljani. Na temelju analize dostupnih izvora, rasprava, mišljenja, ispitivanja i intervjua donose se određene preporuke o regulaciji uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju u Sloveniji.

Ključne riječi: visoko obrazovanje; internacionalizacija; jezična politika; slovenska sveučilišna politika.

Uvod

U novome tisućljeću na europsko je visoko obrazovanje najviše utjecala Bolonjska deklaracija (Europski prostor visokoga obrazovanja, Zajednička izjava europskih ministara obrazovanja, Bologna, 19. lipnja 1999.). Temeljni je cilj te deklaracije povećanje „međunarodne kompetitivnosti europskoga visokoobrazovnog sustava“ i uspostavljanje zajedničkoga europskoga prostora visokoga obrazovanja do 2010. godine:¹¹ „Ovime se obvezujemo postići te ciljeve – unutar okvira naših institucionalnih ovlasti i uvažavajući u potpunosti različitost kultura, jezika, nacionalnih obrazovnih sustava i autonomiju Sveučilišta – kako bismo učvrstili europski prostor visokoga obrazovanja.“ (str. 2)

¹¹ Pregled tijeka i ministarskih sastanaka na: <http://www.eua.be/eua-work-and-policy-area/building-the-european-higher-education-area/bologna-basics.aspx> (23. 8. 2014.).

Izveštaj Europske udruge sveučilišta (engl. EUA) iz 2010. godine navodi kako je 46 zemalja implementiralo Bolonjsku deklaraciju te da je najviši postotak ostvaren unutar jedinstvene dvociklusne strukture, a da ostala područja ostaju drugačije organizirana. Dokument od 124 stranice dotiče se i pitanja jezika, upućujući na to da su razlog manjemu broju stranih studenata slabe jezične vještine odlaznih studenata i nacionalna jezična politika „koja ograničava poučavanje na nenacionalnim jezicima ili zahtijeva provođenja ispita na nacionalnome jeziku” (Bologna Declaration, 1999, str. 80). U dokumentu se prepoznaje da je internacionalizacija središnja strategija većine institucija i da je jedna od njezinih prednosti mogućnost poučavanja na stranome jeziku (str. 81). U prilogu dokumentu nalazi se upitnik koji je upotrijebljen kao evaluacijski izveštaj, a u kojemu se navodi da je jedan od načina poboljšanja „privlačnosti” institucije nudi „novih kolegija na engleskome jeziku ili na nekome drugome velikome europskom jeziku” (str. 107).

Tako je u deset godina obećanje o potpunom uvažavanju različitosti kultura, jezika itd. iz izvornoga dokumenta ponešto izblijedjelo, a pitanje jezične politike europskoga prostora visokoga obrazovanja sada sustiže sudbina pitanja jezične politike Europske unije. Kao rezultat izbora između višejezičnosti u teoriji i engleskoga jezika kao *lingue france* u praksi, polarizirana se mišljenja sukobljavaju nad, s jedne strane, hegemonijom engleskoga jezika i pobunom protiv njega te, s druge strane, pragmatičnom rezigniranošću spram stvarnosti u kojoj engleski jezik *de facto* postaje jezikom ujedinjene Europe (npr. Airey, 2004; Bjorkman, 2014; Brock-Utne, 2001, 2007; Gnutzmann, 2005; Hughes, 2008; Kalin Golob, 2001, 2010, 2012; Phillipson, 2003, 2006; Stickel, 2010; Stabej, 2010a, 2010b, 2012).

Prema Phillipsonu (2006, str. 14), bila bi riječ o pretjeranome pojednostavljivanju kada bi se uvela lažna totalitarna dihotomija „ili si s nama, ili si protiv nas”¹², što znači ili za engleski ili protiv njega u jezičnoj politici: „Engleski otvara neka vrata, ali zatvara druga. Može se upotrebljavati i u dobre i u loše svrhe, s dobrim ili lošim rezultatima, ali u suvremenome se svijetu ne može ignorirati.”

Jezična politika u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju u poslijebolonjskoj Europi izvorno se analizirala u Kalin Golob i sur. (2014).¹³ Čini se da i u Sloveniji oni koji raspravljaju o tome pitanju ne mogu izbjeći stalno podizanje tenzija opredjeljujući se za jednu od dviju krajnosti: s jedne je strane potpuna otvorenost uporabi jezika (što bi u krajnosti dovelo do toga da engleski zamjeni slovenski kao dominantni jezik visokoga školstva), a s druge je strane ozbiljno ograničavanje čak i u slučajevima kada bi ponuda kolegija na stranome jeziku bila prijeko potrebna.

Cilj je ovoga rada, koji se nastavlja na naše prethodne radove, identificirati mogućnosti produktivnoga razvoja regulacije uporabe jezika u slovenskome

¹² Phillipson citira Bushevu dihotomiju: ili ste na našoj strani ili na strani terorista.

¹³ U radu ćemo predstaviti analizu i istraživanje već objavljeno na slovenskome jeziku. Nadalje, rezultati su analizirani ovisno o stajalištu prema uporabi jezika u visokome obrazovanju, a ona su podijeljena u tri skupine koje proizlaze iz uzorka studenata i nastavnika Sveučilišta u Ljubljani.

visokom obrazovanju. Naše je polazište status slovenskoga kao službenoga jezika Republike Slovenije (RS) i glavnoga jezika cijeloga javnog obrazovanja u RS; ipak, prepoznavamo potrebu za većom uključenošću stranih studenata i nastavnika i za daljnjim poboljšanjem kvalitete visokoga obrazovanja. U sljedećim dijelovima stoga najprije predstavljamo zakonski okvir i slovensku jezičnu politiku, a potom stavove dionika prema jezicima u visokome obrazovanju (na temelju intervjua i ispitivanja). Stavovi su analitički strukturirani u tri postojeća obrasca razumijevanja uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju karakteristična za studente i nastavnike (koristio se pristup multivarijantnoga grupiranja):

- a) „za slovenski”
- b) „za engleski”
- c) „kozmpolitski”

Na kraju, na temelju teorijskoga okvira, prethodnih istraživanja, analize zakonodavstva i politika, kao i na temelju ispitivanja i intervjua, predlažemo smjernice za regulaciju uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju u Sloveniji:

- a) Cilj jezične politike koju podržavamo i predlažemo jest okretanje kozmpolitskome stajalištu.
- b) Kako bi se takva promjena stava mogla ostvariti, predlažemo sljedeće mjere na razmatranje onima koji donose odluke:
 - a) veća svjesnost o važnosti nacionalnoga jezika
 - b) obveza države da pruži formalni zakonodavni okvir
 - c) razvoj i operacionalizacija jezične strategije kao odgovornost sveučilišta.

Zakonodavni okvir i jezična politika

Kao i u drugim članicama EU-a, u Sloveniji regulacija uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju proizlazi iz različitih odredbi na različitim razinama (Accetto, 2010, str. 25):

- Članak 11. Ustava Republike Slovenije definira slovenski kao službeni jezik, a u područjima talijanske i mađarske manjine službeni jezici također su talijanski i mađarski.
- Zakon o javnoj uporabi slovenskoga jezika¹⁴ u članku 12. definira da se obrazovanje od predškolske do sveučilišne razine odvija na slovenskome jeziku, a uporaba se drugih jezika dopušta u skladu s propisima specifičnima za određeno obrazovno područje. U istome se Zakonu u članku 13. promiče učenje slovenskoga jezika u Sloveniji. S tom svrhom Vlada Republike Slovenije mora usvojiti program koji će biti „dodatak redovnim obrazovnim programima za poboljšanje jezičnih sposobnosti mladih i odraslih građana te programima za strance u Sloveniji”, kao i posebne programe za promicanje slovenskoga jezika u stranim obrazovnim institucijama.

¹⁴ Zakon o javnoj uporabi slovenskoga jezika, Narodne novine Republike Slovenije, br. 86/2004, str. 10114.

- Područno specifičan Zakon o visokome obrazovanju¹⁵ posvećuje članak 8. jeziku poučavanja, slovenskom. No, visokoobrazovne institucije mogu nuditi studijske programe ili dijelove programa na stranome jeziku pod uvjetima postavljenima njihovim statutima (odnosno da se studijski programi stranih jezika, dijelovi programa u kojima sudjeluju strani gostujući nastavnici, programi koje pohađa velik broj stranih studenata i programi koji se izvode uz strani jezik i na slovenskome, mogu izvoditi na stranome jeziku). Zakon također definira da visokoobrazovne institucije „osiguravaju razvoj slovenskoga kao stručnoga ili znanstvenoga jezika”, da „bi stranim građanima i Slovencima bez slovenskoga državljanstva trebalo omogućiti da uče slovenski” te da „ministar odgovoran za visoko obrazovanje definira detaljne načine osiguranja razvoja i učenja slovenskoga jezika”;
- U listopadu 2013. godine novi je nacrt Zakona o visokome obrazovanju upućen na javnu raspravu, dodajući tri nove mogućnosti uključivanja studijskih programa na stranome jeziku (cijeli se studijski program, a ne samo njegov dio, može ponuditi na stranome jeziku ako kolegij drži gostujući nastavnik¹⁶ i kada je upisan značajan broj stranih studenata; zajednički se programi također mogu nuditi na stranome jeziku, kao i programi koji pripadaju stranoj matičnoj obrazovnoj instituciji), no nacrt nije uspio razriješiti trenutne nedoumice, pa stoga i dalje omogućuje nastavak netransparentnih programa i uključivanja kolegija na stranome jeziku, a na račun slovenskoga kao jezika visokoga obrazovanja. Uslijed promjene vlasti prijedlog zakona nije prošao.
- Nadležno ministarstvo pripremiло je prijedlog 26. veljače 2016. kojim bi se članak 8. proširio na način da se studijski programi mogu izvoditi na stranome jeziku „ako visokoobrazovna institucija također nudi usporediv studijski program ili njegov dio na slovenskome jeziku”¹⁷. Nadalje, stavak peti preciznije definira kategoriju stranaca koji uz Slovence bez državljanstva mogu učiti slovenski jezik; riječ je o visokoobrazovnim nastavnicima, suradnicima i studentima. Uklanjanjem stavka šestoga iz Zakona, skrb za razvoj slovenskoga jezika u potpunosti prelazi u nadležnost visokoobrazovnih institucija, a obveza nadležnoga ministra da regulira to pitanje posebnim odlukama u potpunosti je uklonjena. U svome mišljenju od 13. rujna 2016., Zakonodavna i pravna služba Narodne skupštine istaknula je, u skladu s Ustavom i pravnim sustavom, da je stavak o usporedivosti studijskih programa nedovoljno definiran. Nakon turbulentnih rasprava, koje su još povećale polariziranost pogleda na jezik u visokome obrazovanju i nisu iznjedrile konstruktivna i stručno utemeljena rješenja, prijedlog novoga članka 8. povučen je. Stoga zakon ostaje nepromijenjen što se tiče jezika visokoga obrazovanja.

¹⁵ Dostupno na <http://www.uradni-list.si/1/objava.jsp?urlid=201232&stevilka=1406> (1. 11. 2012).

¹⁶ U dijelu u kojemu se objašnjavaju pojedini članci zakona (str. 137) iznosi se da se dva kumulativna uvjeta moraju zadovoljiti.

¹⁷ Zakon o izmjeni Zakona visokoga obrazovanja – prijedlog

- Slovenske (javne) visokoobrazovne institucije dosad nisu uspjele (unatoč brojnim pozivima da to učine) ponuditi smjernice jezične politike. Primorsko sveučilište 2011. godine pripremilo je prvi pregled jezične politike u skladu sa smjernicama Europske komisije. Druga dva slovenska sveučilišta još uvijek nisu pripremila takav dokument; Sveučilište u Ljubljani još nije oblikovalo svoju jezičnu politiku, unatoč izravnim pozivima za sustavna rješenja jezičnih problema od 2006. godine, a i Sveučilište u Mariboru još uvijek je u procesu stvaranja dokumenta.

Prema strategijama slovenskih sveučilišta, pojedinačnim strategijama fakulteta, Nacionalnome programu visokoga obrazovanja 2011. – 2020. te ostalim dokumentima, internacionalizacija je jedan od ključnih čimbenika ovoga stoljeća. No, nije bilo, uopće ili u dovoljnoj mjeri, razmatranja i sustavnih rješenja za operacionalizaciju strategije internacionalizacije ili za regulaciju pitanja jezične politike.

Inicijative jezikoslovne struke kojima je cilj bio da se pitanje jezika visokoga obrazovanja razmatra transparentno i sustavno naišle su na različite reakcije: od mišljenja da je ustrajanje na zakonskoj obveznosti slovenskoga kao jezika poučavanja u visokome obrazovanju problematično i ograničavajuće u odnosu na internacionalizaciju i kvalitetu visokoga obrazovanja, preko prijedloga da bi fakulteti i sveučilišta trebali sami biti slobodni odlučivati koji je jezik poučavanja, do eksplicitnih izjava visokih dužnosnika¹⁸ da se kvaliteta visokoga obrazovanja jedino može poboljšati stranim nastavnicima i uporabom engleskoga kao jezika poučavanja. Deset godina od akreditacije prvih bolonjskih studijskih programa u Sloveniji, slovenska jezična politika u visokome obrazovanju još uvijek nije razrađena i povezana sa strategijama internacionalizacije ili uopće razvoja visokoga obrazovanja.

Neusklađenost zakonodavstva, strategija fakulteta/sveučilišta i nacionalne strategije stvara situaciju koja vodi traženju „rupa” koje omogućavaju uključivanje stranih studenata. Uslijed poluzakonite improvizacije rješenja su tek djelomična, nedovoljno osmišljena, a izostaju i značajna intelektualna i materijalna sredstva. Rezultati ispitivanja među stranim studentima otkrivaju (Kalin Golob i sur., 2014) da uglavnom svoje znanje drugoga stranog jezika procjenjuju nedovoljno dobrim kako bi mogli studirati na tom jeziku. S toga aspekta imalo bi smisla povećati ponudu tečajeva slovenskoga jezika za strane studente i strane suradnike. Iako je zanimanje za tečajeve slovenskoga kao drugog jezika veliko, posebice među redovno upisanim stranim studentima, podatci iz istraživanja upućuju na to da trenutno nema značajnog zanimanja za učenjem slovenskoga jezika među studentima na razmjeni. Čak i oni koji su naučili slovenski jezik, nemaju dovoljno znanja kako bi svoje studentske obveze ispunili na slovenskome jeziku.

Svaka bi daljnja regulacija jezičnih pitanja u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju trebala proizlaziti iz stvarnih potreba za kvalitetnom internacionalizacijom i

¹⁸ Državni tajnik dr. Dušan Lesjak iz Ministarstva za visoko obrazovanje u radioemisiji Intelakta 18. srpnja 2006.

poštivanjem slovenskoga kao službenoga jezika. No, dosadašnja polarizirana mišljenja odražavaju se u prezaštitničkom stavu prema slovenskome jeziku ili pak u potpunome izostanku razumijevanja praktičnih i simboličkih aspekata regulacije jezika; takva mišljenja moramo nadići. Regulacija mora biti usmjerena na „potragu za pravom ravnotežom između poučavanja na materinskome jeziku i pružanja prilika za razvoj vještina uporabe stranoga jezika, budući da oboje predstavljaju *sine qua non* osobnoga i profesionalnoga razvoja pojedinaca” (Bergan, 2001, str. 7).

Da slovenski jezik ne sprečava kvalitetnu internacionalizaciju, pokazuju rješenja Nacionalnoga programa jezične politike 2014. – 2018. (NPJP). Ona se temelje na pretpostavci da „slovenska sveučilišta i Republika Slovenija žele održati i dalje razvijati slovenski kao jezik visokoga obrazovanja i jezik znanosti, iako također žele dati međunarodnu dimenziju svome djelovanju, kao i biti međunarodno kompetitivni” (NPJP, str. 28).

Program stoga definira (str. 29, 30):

- da bi Ministarstvo obrazovanja, znanosti i sporta te sveučilišta, na temelju Zakona o visokome obrazovanju (dopune u tijeku), Odluke o nacionalnome programu visokoga obrazovanja te Strategije trebalo uspostaviti transparentne oblike razumnoga uključivanja stranih studenata i nastavnika u visokom obrazovanju: (1) s kvalitetnim usporednim programima i izbornim modulima, posebno osmišljenima za studente na razmjeni, s kolegijima koje bi mogli izabrati i domaći studenti ako ispunjavaju tražene uvjete (u skladu sa sljedećom točkom mjera); (2) uvođenjem koncepta diferencirane višejezičnosti koji slijedi pozitivne primjere iz drugih zemalja. Prema tome konceptu, jezik visokoga obrazovanja jest onaj koji prevladava u okruženju, a simultani (računalni) prijevod na drugi jezik nudi se studentima koji nisu dovoljno ovladali jezikom visokoga obrazovanja. Prozirnice i drugi nastavni materijali u pravilu su dvojezični, na jeziku okruženja i na stranome jeziku, a konzultacije sa stranim studentima također se održavaju na stranome jeziku; (3) promoviranjem studentske solidarnosti i tutorstva ili partnerstva između domaćih i stranih studenata;
- zakonodavstvo bi trebalo definirati obvezni većinski dio visokoobrazovnih programa koji se nude na slovenskome jeziku, umjesto da se to pitanje ostavi sveučilištima. Iako se strateško usmjerenje sveučilišta i države u pogledu povećanja mobilnosti i programa razmjene podudaraju, Ministarstvo obrazovanja, znanosti i sporta i visokoobrazovne institucije trebali bi dogovoriti primjeren način financiranja;
- kada je riječ o doktorskim studijima, sveučilištima je dana potpuna autonomija u pogledu jezične politike, uvažavajući pritom ustavna i zakonska ograničenja i opće načelo da slovenski nastavnici ne bi trebali predavati slovenskim studentima na stranome jeziku.

Ova rezolucija o jeziku nudi mogućnost uključivanja stranih studenata i nastavnika, kao i poboljšanje kvalitete visokoga obrazovanja sa slovenskim i usporednim, ili

posebno osmišljenim, kolegijima na stranome jeziku. Ponajviše, ona može očuvati ulogu slovenskoga kao jezika visokoga obrazovanja i znanosti, što bi se trebalo omogućiti odgovornom nacionalnom politikom.

Metode - podatci i analiza

Empirijsko je istraživanje definirano kao kombinacija elektroničkih ispitivanja osmišljenih za tri ciljne skupine (nastavnici u visokom obrazovanju, domaći i strani studenti) i dubinskih intervjuja provedenih s donositeljima odluka u području jezične politike u visokome obrazovanju (rektorima, dekanima i prodekanima odabranih fakulteta). U oba smo se slučaja usredotočili na tri javna sveučilišta: Sveučilište u Ljubljani, Sveučilište u Mariboru i Primorsko sveučilište.

Ispitivanje

Ispitivanje je provedeno u prvoj polovini listopada 2012. godine i sastojalo se od triju dijelova. U prvome se dijelu ispitanike tražilo da odgovore na pitanja koja su nam omogućila da ih razvrstamo u različite sociodemografske skupine. Uz osnovne demografske podatke (spol i dob) sveučilišni su nastavnici također pitani o sveučilištu, fakultetu i programu na kojemu predaju, njihovu zvanju, materinskome jeziku i radnome stažu (u godinama). Studenti su pitani o sveučilištu, fakultetu i programu na kojemu su upisani, razini i vrsti studija, kao i materinskome jeziku.

Drugi se dio upitnika za obje skupine, sveučilišne nastavnike i studente, sastojao uglavnom od činjeničnih pitanja kojima je svrha bila ispitivanje stvarne situacije u pogledu uporabe slovenskoga jezika u visokome obrazovanju i upoznatosti s opsegom i oblicima trenutnoga uključivanja kolegija i programa na slovenskome i na engleskome jeziku ili na drugim stranim jezicima na slovenskim sveučilištima. Studenti i nastavnici procijenili su svoje vještine slušanja s razumijevanjem, čitanja, govorenja i pisanja na stranome jeziku. Procijenili su i svoju uspješnost u engleskome jeziku i drugim europskim jezicima koji imaju najveći broj govornika, a također su imali i mogućnost dodavanja drugih jezika. Osim toga, morali su procijeniti (na ljestvici od 0 do 5) učestalost uporabe slovenskoga i engleskoga jezika i drugih jezika u raznim obrazovnim aktivnostima (predavanjima, praktičnoj nastavi, seminarima, konzultacijama, pismenim i usmenim ispitima, seminarskim radovima i drugim pisanim zadacima, literaturi). U sljedećim dvama pitanjima nastavnici su također pitani o svojim očekivanjima u pogledu jezičnih sposobnosti domaćih i stranih studenata, nakon čega su odgovarali na pitanje o duljini svog iskustva držanja obrazovnih aktivnosti na stranome jeziku. U ovome su dijelu upitnika studenti trebali reći za koji jezik očekuju da će se njime najviše koristiti u svome budućem zanimanju.

U trećemu dijelu upitnika koristila se ljestvica od pet stupnjeva kako bi se procijenila gledišta sveučilišnih nastavnika i studenata u vezi s obrazovnim procesima na slovenskim sveučilištima koji se odvijaju na engleskome jeziku, te njihovo slaganje s navodnim prednostima i nedostacima visokoga obrazovanja na slovenskome i na engleskome jeziku na slovenskim sveučilištima.

Od 715 nastavnika uključenih u ispitivanje upitnik je ispunilo 469¹⁹ nastavnika. Od 2822 domaća studenta uključenih u ispitivanje upitnik je ispunilo njih 2331²⁰, a od 283 strana studenta njih 236.

Intervjui

Dubinski intervjui provedeni s predstavnicima uprave fakulteta sastojali su se od dvaju dijelova. Prvi je dio imao cilj prikupljanja točnih podataka o uključivanju studijskih programa za studente na razmjeni na fakultetima ispitanika, a u drugome se dijelu ispitivalo gledište ispitanika u vezi s uporabom slovenskoga i engleskoga jezika i drugih stranih jezika u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju, kao i njihovo stajalište u pogledu prijedloga regulacije toga pitanja na razini fakulteta, sveučilišta i države.

Dubinski su intervjui provedeni s rektorima Sveučilišta u Ljubljani i Sveučilišta u Mariboru te s dekanima sljedećih fakulteta ljubljanskoga Sveučilišta: Filozofskoga fakulteta, Fakulteta društvenih znanosti, Biotehničkoga fakulteta i Pedagoškoga fakulteta, a imali smo i transkript intervju s upravom Ekonomskoga fakulteta iz prijašnjega istraživanja. Na Sveučilištu u Mariboru intervjui su provedeni s dekanom Fakulteta ekonomije i poslovanja, Filozofskoga fakulteta i Fakulteta za elektrotehniku i računalstvo. S Primorskoga je sveučilišta na naš poziv odgovorio prodekan za međunarodnu suradnju s Filozofskoga fakulteta.

Rezultati

Stavovi dionika o jezicima u visokome obrazovanju

Za potrebe ovoga rada sažimamo ključne rezultate istraživanja. Opsežan opis statistike iz istraživanja i transkripti intervju s donositeljima odluka mogu se pronaći u *monografiji Language Policy and Languages of Higher Education in Slovenia* (Jezična politika i jezici visokoga obrazovanja u Sloveniji) (Kalin Golob i sur., 2014).

Rezultati našega istraživanja provedenoga među osobljem, studentima i donositeljima odluka u visokome obrazovanju pokazuju da je uporaba engleskoga kao jezika poučavanja – s iznimkom nastavnih materijala na engleskome – trenutno ograničena na obrazovanje stranih studenata. Otprilike tri četvrtine slovenskih studenata ispunjava sve svoje studentske obveze na slovenskome, a više od polovine ispitanika iz redova sveučilišnih nastavnika nikada nije predavalo na engleskome jeziku. Studenti i nastavnici, kao i uprava fakulteta, engleski vide kao dodatan jezik poučavanja koji su visokoobrazovne ustanove dužne ponuditi kako bi se ostvario cilj međunarodnoga uključivanja uvjetovanoga internacionalizacijom, ali se ponajprije ne upotrebljava u komunikaciji s domaćim studentima.

¹⁹ Uspjeli smo uključiti 8 % nastavnika sa slovenskih javnih sveučilišta.

²⁰ U ovom smo slučaju također uključili uzorak od 8 % studenata upisanih na sveučilišne studijske programe slovenskih sveučilišta.

Ključni podatci iz intervjuja

Intervjui s donositeljima odluka s odabranih fakulteta pokazuju da je organizacija obrazovnih aktivnosti na engleskome jeziku (za strane studente) u pravilu odgovornost fakulteta ili čak odsjeka na fakultetima. Organizacija je većinom prepuštena volji pojedinih nastavnika budući da nije sustavno osmišljena i planirana na razini sveučilišta ili države. Nadalje, ne postoji nikakva financijska podrška, što su gotovo svi intervjuirani donositelji odluka prepoznali kao ključan problem.

Stoga, kao što su donositelji odluka istaknuli u svojim odgovorima, raznolikost i količina sadržaja na slovenskim fakultetima, a koji se izvode na engleskome jeziku, često je nedovoljna. Donositelji odluka govore o nemogućnosti uključivanja stranih studenata u nastavu, uslijed čega izostaje kontakt stranih studenata sa slovenskim vršnjacima, što bi trebao biti jedan od glavnih ciljeva studentske razmjene; još jedan problem jest taj što nastavnici zapravo predaju na stranome jeziku volonterski i u slobodno vrijeme. Implementacija internacionalizacije, nacionalnoga cilja zapisanoga u temeljnim razvojnim dokumentima, stoga zapravo često ostaje na izbor pojedinim nastavnicima te se temelji isključivo na njihovu osjećaju odgovornosti prema studentima.

Donositelji odluka s fakulteta na kojima se sa stranim studentima radi većinom putem konzultacija i individualnih aktivnosti ističu da će trenutna rješenja biti dovoljno dobra sve dok je broj stranih studenata relativno malen. Povećanje broja stranih studenata koje sveučilišta uključuju u svoje srednjoročne razvojne planove zahtijevaju značajnu promjenu. S druge strane, upravo ograničen broj stranih studenata i njihova raspršenost u različitim kolegijima jest prepreka izvođenju kolegija na stranome jeziku, prema stajalištu uprava fakulteta. Slovenski studenti na dvama fakultetima uključenima u ovo istraživanje dijelom su doprinijeli takvoj situaciji odbijajući prisustvovati predavanjima slovenskih nastavnika na engleskome jeziku samo zato što je u predavaonici bilo nekoliko stranih studenata. Da je tu bilo riječi više o načelu negoli nesposobnosti učenja na engleskome jeziku ili pak nedovoljnoj pripremljenosti slovenskih nastavnika da predaju na engleskome jeziku može se zaključiti iz pozitivne samoprocjene slovenskih studenata i nastavnika u pogledu sposobnosti uporabe engleskoga jezika, kao i iz procjene nastavnika o razini znanja engleskoga jezika studenata te procjene studenata o sposobnosti uporabe engleskoga jezika nastavnika.

Ni na jednom od fakulteta ne provjerava se sposobnost nastavnika da predaju na engleskome jeziku – njihovo se zvanje smatra dovoljnim dokazom jezične sposobnosti. Fakulteti, usto, ne pružaju nikakvo jezično osposobljavanje pa je skrb o jezičnoj sposobnosti u prvome jeziku i drugim jezicima prepuštena volji pojedinca. Osposobljavanje u području višejezičnoga akademskog diskursa za studente i nastavnike trenutno se planira samo u smjernicama internacionalizacije Primorskoga sveučilišta. Situacija je drukčija kada su u pitanju studenti. Većina odabranih fakulteta organizira jezično obrazovanje za studente na razini institucije – slovenski studenti

poboljšavaju svoju razinu srednjoškolskoga engleskog jezika barem na prvim dvjema godinama tako što slušaju kolegije engleskoga kao jezika struke, na kojima se usto upoznaju s engleskim nazivljem iz svoje struke.

Razumijevanje internacionalizacije kao poluge za poboljšanje položaja slovenskih fakulteta na međunarodnim ljestvicama kvalitete i za povećanje mogućnosti osiguravanja dodatnih financijskih sredstava značajno je više izraženo među članovima uprave fakulteta (dekanima i prodekanima) nego u ostalim skupinama dionika. Donositelji odluka s takvim pogledima na internacionalizaciju također vjeruju u sljedeće: obrazovanje je industrija, odnosno profitabilna grana, a trenutna je zakonska regulacija uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju rigidna i stoga sprečava razvoj slovenskih sveučilišta. Za te je članove uprave karakteristično i da su skloniji izvođenju dijela programa na engleskome jeziku i za domaće studente jer to vide prednošću koja će studentima omogućiti bolji položaj na tržištu rada. Želja studenata da studiraju na slovenskome bila je u tome kontekstu protumačena kao pokušaj da se ide lakšim putem, što je tipično za manje uspješne ili slabije motivirane studente.

Donositelji odluka s drugih fakulteta oprezniji su u pogledu internacionalizacije kao rješenja za sve probleme slovenskih sveučilišta te naglašavaju kako je izvođenje kolegija na engleskome jeziku nužno, ali da to nije dovoljno za privlačenje stranih studenata i nastavnika. Visok postotak sadržaja na engleskome jeziku koji bi trebao privući strane studente i tako djelomino nadomjestiti odljev mozgova u vidu domaćih studenata mogao bi zapravo biti jedan od razloga koji doprinosi odluci slovenskih studenata da studiraju u inozemstvu (ako se sadržaj poučava na engleskome i u domovini i izvan nje).

Istodobno, može se vidjeti da sadržaj na engleskome jeziku nije nužno rješenje za nadilaženje jezičnih prepreka. Gotovo svi donositelji odluka rekli su da strani studenti – posebno iz određenih skupina europskih zemalja – imaju tako velike poteškoće u uporabi engleskoga jezika da poučavanje na engleskome predstavlja prepreku uspješnome učenju. Intervjuirani donositelji odluka s filozofskih fakulteta triju sveučilišta pogotovo su oni koji ističu da se proces internacionalizacije očigledno ne razumije ako ga se poistovjećuje s uključivanjem engleskoga kao jezika poučavanja. Internacionalizacija bi u načelu trebala voditi višejezičnosti i višekulturnosti, a ne tomu da *lingua franca* zamijeni nacionalni jezik. Prema njihovu mišljenju, slovensko visoko obrazovanje bolje bi iskoristilo internacionalizaciju kada bi se otvorilo susjednim zemljama.

Članovi uprave fakulteta poprilično su dobro informirani o učinkovitosti i problemima pružanja sadržaja stranim studentima na načine na koje se to sada čini na njihovim fakultetima. Procjenjuju da kombinacija važećih pravnih i financijskih okvira omogućuje jedino takav sustav i stoga nisu skloni razmišljati o mogućim promjenama i poboljšanjima. Prijedlozi za regulaciju uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju od intervjuiranih donositelja odluka bili su veoma općeniti. Postalo je jasno da većina onih koji se slažu da postoji potreba za pravnom regulacijom

toga pitanja ne smatraju shodnim mijenjati postojeći pravni okvir. Prema njihovu mišljenju, imalo bi smisla početi iskorištavati prednosti koje postojeći zakon već nudi i steći dovoljno praktičnoga iskustva u organizaciji studija na stranome jeziku, što bi se moglo upotrijebiti kao pokazatelj potrebe za promjenama. Druga skupina mišljenja naglašava potrebu za deregulacijom koja bi sveučilištima trebala omogućiti kompetitivnu prednost na međunarodnome tržištu. Predložena sustavna regulacija na sveučilišnoj razini djelomično je povezana s procjenom (koja je manje-više dana napamet) kako bi i koliko svaki fakultet trebao povećati postotak sadržaja koji se nudi na engleskome jeziku. S obzirom na to da nitko ne smatra da je izvedivo ponuditi usporedni studijski program na slovenskome i engleskome jeziku, koliko i koji dio sadržaja treba ponuditi na engleskome domaćim studentima ostaje upitno. Treća skupina mišljenja gleda na kvalitetu i privlačnost kolegija ponuđenih na engleskome jeziku kao na glavni dio te proizlazi iz vjerovanja da bi bilo lakše ponuditi takav tip kolegija kada bi se sveučilištu prepustilo da koordinira njihovo osmišljavanje. Programi ponajprije osmišljeni u skladu s potrebama i interesima stranih studenata, ali koji su također otvoreni i domaćim studentima, stoga ne bi bili u sukobu s redovnim obrazovnim procesima na slovenskim sveučilištima, a koji bi se i dalje odvijali na slovenskome.

Ključni podatci iz upitnika

Rezultati ispitivanja provedenoga među domaćim i stranim studentima pokazuju da oni uglavnom procjenjuju da njihovo znanje stranoga jezika nije dovoljno dobro da bi na njemu studirali. Stoga bi bilo razumno povećati ponudu tečajeva slovenskoga jezika za strane studente i suradnike, kao i broj tečajeva engleskoga i drugih stranih jezika za slovenske studente i nastavnike. Trenutno te tečajeve za sve članove sveučilišta izvodi Centar za jezike Filozofskoga fakulteta, a trebalo bi ih učiniti što jeftinijima ili čak, ako je to moguće, besplatnima.

Dok je zanimanje za tečajeve slovenskoga kao drugoga jezika veliko među redovnim stranim studentima, prema ispitivanju se čini da nema znatnoga zanimanja među studentima na razmjeni da uče slovenski. Usto, čak i oni koji su učili slovenski, ne smatraju da imaju dovoljno znanja da bi svoje studentske obveze mogli ispunjavati na slovenskome jeziku.

Tumačenje da studiranje na engleskome ima dodatnu vrijednost, samo po sebi nije u skladu sa stajalištima domaćih studenata i nastavnika izraženima u ispitivanju. U prosjeku, ne pripisuju nikakve posebne prednosti studiranju na engleskome u usporedbi sa studiranjem na slovenskome jeziku. Jedina je iznimka da engleski omogućava «bolje mogućnosti studiranja u inozemstvu».

Što se stavova studenata tiče, najvažniji su rezultati sljedeći: studenti su u prosjeku veoma načelni i složni u potpori slovenskome kao glavnome jeziku slovenskoga visokog obrazovanja – posebice na dodiplomskoj razini. Izravno daju podršku jezičnoj politici koja teži očuvanju trenutne situacije i u budućnosti, osiguravajući

tako potpunu funkcionalnost nacionalnoga jezika i odbijajući pragmatično i tržištu okrenuto obrazovanje koje vodi k dominaciji engleskoga. Studenti stoga slovenski vide kao vrijednost, a sigurno ne kao prepreku globalizaciji obrazovanja ili kao logičan izbor u privatnoj sferi. Ipak, unatoč jedinstvenoj potpori slovenskome, studenti ne poriču potrebu za višejezičnošću i uporabom engleskoga jezika u umreženome svijetu pa njihova privrženost slovenskome ne ide u krajnost budući da oni (iako blago) odbijaju opći i radikalni jezični protekcionizam. Studenti su podijeljeni kada je riječ o izravnoj usporedbi kvalitete i prednosti studiranja na slovenskome i na engleskome jeziku. Usto, tek se umjereno slažu s u javnosti najčešće upotrijebljenim argumentom za studiranjem na engleskome, tj. s time da ono daje prednost obrazovanju i radu u inozemstvu.

Kako mi razumijemo navedene rezultate, studenti su procijenili izjave o uporabi jezika u visokome obrazovanju iz dviju različitih perspektiva; s jedne strane, učinili su to izrazito iz vlastite perspektive, razmatrajući posljedice i učinke uporabe određenoga jezika poučavanja izravno na njih same; s druge strane, kada su izražavali svoje stajalište o izjavama koje opisuju slučaj s kojim nemaju izravnoga iskustva, svoje su odgovore temeljili na apstraktnijemu okviru načela i vrijednosti u pogledu važnosti određenoga jezika i njegove uporabe ili su izražavali svoje (ne)slaganje većinom *ad hoc*, bez utemeljenja u prethodno dobro oblikovanome mišljenju. Stoga, mišljenja o uporabi jezika u visokome obrazovanju koja su studenti iznijeli odražavaju dva različita obrasca (utemeljena na osobnim iskustvima i na apstraktnim načelima). Nadalje, njihovi su odgovori na određen način veoma slični onima koje su dali dekani i rektori – njihova su stajališta jasna na izrazito načelnoj, apstraktnoj razini, ali kako pitanja postaju konkretnija, njihova stajališta postaju manje jasna.

Vjerujemo da je ključni aspekt odgovora studenata taj da uporabu svoga prvog jezika vide očiglednom u svim komunikacijskim područjima. Rezultati su jednaki za dodiplomske i diplomatske studente, budući da su prosjek i distribucija odgovora jednaki bez obzira na razinu studija.

Tipologija stavova o jeziku među studentima i nastavnicima Sveučilišta u Ljubljani

Nakon razmatranja općenite slike pitanja uporabe jezika na slovenskim sveučilištima, ispitali smo sličnosti i razlike među pojedincima i utvrdili tipične obrasce razumijevanja uloge jezika u visokome obrazovanju te tako razvili tipologiju stavova o jeziku. Drugim riječima, podijelili smo studente i nastavnike s ljubljanskoga Sveučilišta koji su sudjelovali u istraživanju u skupine, a na temelju njihovih gledišta i s ciljem uspostavljanja kohezivnih skupina sa što sličnijim gledištima; skupine su trebale biti što različitije jedna od druge. Broj skupina nije unaprijed bio određen, a veličina najmanje skupine nije bila ograničena. S obzirom na prirodu problema (podatci su stajališta) i mjernu razinu podataka (intervalska ljestvica), najprije je odabrana kombinacija Wardove metode hijerarhijskoga klasteriranja i Euklidske udaljenosti

(Johnson i Wichern, 1992, str. 573-602), a potom je metoda K-srednjih vrijednosti (Johnson i Wichern, 1992, str. 573-602) primijenjena u završnome dijelu postupka. U obje se metode najboljom opcijom pokazala podjela ispitanika (studenata i nastavnika) u tri skupine. Rezultati klasteriranja dvaju poduzoraka u tri skupine dobivene dvjema metodama konzistentni su, što upućuje na to da je rješenje stabilno.

Analiza je otkrila tri jednaka obrasca razmišljanja o pitanju uporabe jezika u obama poduzorcima (studenti i nastavnici). Nazvali smo ih „za slovenski”, „za engleski” i „kozmpolitski”. Riječ je o trima tipičnim i prevladavajućim obrascima koji su obično prisutni u razmatranju toga pitanja kod slovenskih i europskih političkih tijela i ograna koji su povezani s visokim obrazovanjem i jezikoslovljem, kao i kod novinarskih i širih društvenih rasprava na tu temu; zbog toga su predvidljivi i očekivani. Dodatna vrijednost takve segmentacije jest procjenjivanje veličine (značajnosti) svake skupine i točnoga stajališta svake skupine u pogledu raznih pitanja.

Nastavljamo s detaljnijim predstavljanjem triju skupina studenata s različitim stavovima o spomenutim pitanjima. U tablici koja slijedi mogu se vidjeti prosječne vrijednosti po skupinama, dobivene metodom K-srednjih vrijednosti, a zamijenjene značenjima prosjeka u odnosu na cjelokupni prosjek ili dobivenu opću sliku stava o jeziku. Kada skupina odstupa od cjelokupnoga prosjeka, ne samo na razini slaganja ili neslaganja, nego i na drugoj strani mjerne ljestvice (npr. cjelokupni prosjek implicira slaganje, a prosjek skupine implicira neslaganje), značenje prosjeka dodano je u polje tablice. Kada to nije slučaj, opisani su jedino razina i smjer odstupanja, a kada odstupanja nema, polje tablice je prazno.

Tablica 1

Prosječne vrijednosti po skupinama

	„kozmpolitski”	„za engleski”	„za slovenski”	svi
Važno mi je ovladati slovenskim kao jezikom struke (engl. LSP) relevantnim za moje područje studija. (S1)		Manje slaganja		Vrlo snažno slaganje
Važno mi je ovladati engleskim kao jezikom struke (engl. LSP) relevantnim za moje područje studija. (S2)	Više slaganja	Više slaganja	Mnogo manje slaganja	Snažno slaganje
Slovenska bi sveučilišta trebala nuditi kolegije domaćim dodiplomskim studentima na slovenskome jeziku, osim kada su u pitanju predavanja stranih predavača. (S3)	Više slaganja	Mnogo manje slaganja = neznatno se ne slažu	Mnogo više slaganja	Slaganje
Slovenska bi sveučilišta trebala nuditi kolegije domaćim diplomskim i doktorskim studentima na slovenskome jeziku, osim kada su u pitanju predavanja stranih predavača. (S4)	Više slaganja	Mnogo manje slaganja = ne slažu se	Mnogo više slaganja	Slabo slaganje

	„kozmpolitski“	„za engleski“	„za slovenski“	svi
Domaći studenti na slovenskim sveučilištima koji pohađaju kolegije na engleskome jeziku imaju bolje mogućnosti za zaposlenje u inozemstvu. (S5)	Više slaganja	Više slaganja	Mnogo manje slaganja = neutralni su	Slabo slaganje
Studijski programi na engleskome jeziku na slovenskim sveučilištima nemaju prednost u usporedbi s onima na slovenskome jeziku. (S6)		Mnogo manje slaganja = neznatno se ne slažu	Mnogo više slaganja = slažu se	Neutralni
Završio/završila bih studij s jednakom kvalitetom kada bi studij bio na engleskome jeziku. (S7)	Više slaganja = neznatno se slažu	Mnogo više slaganja = slažu se	Mnogo više slaganja = ne slažu se	Neutralni
Slovenska bi sveučilišta trebala nuditi tečajeve slovenskoga jezika za strane studente. (S8)	Neznatno više neslaganja	Više neslaganja	Mnogo više slaganja = neutralni su	Slabo neslaganje
Bilo bi dobro kada bi visokoobrazovni proces u Sloveniji (u budućnosti) uključio engleski jezik. (S9)		Mnogo manje neslaganja = neutralni	Mnogo više neslaganja	Neslaganje
Obrazovne bi se aktivnosti na slovenskim sveučilištima uvijek trebale odvijati na engleskome jeziku. (S10)		Mnogo manje neslaganja = gotovo neutralni	Mnogo više neslaganja	Snažno neslaganje
Broj studenata u skupini	411	313	436	

Skupina studenata orijentirana engleskomu jeziku („za engleski“)

Skupina koja najviše odstupa od cjelokupnoga prosjeka studenata jest skupina „za engleski“, koja je usto i najmanja te ju čini otprilike četvrtina studenata. Stavovi te skupine studenata o uporabi jezika u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju razlikuju se od cjelokupnoga prosjeka u sljedećemu: neslaganjem s izjavom da bi se poučavanje domaćih studenata na dodiplomskoj (S3) i diplomskoj razini (S4) studija na slovenskim sveučilištima trebalo odvijati na slovenskome jeziku, osim kada su u pitanju predavanja stranih predavača (studenti se u prosjeku slažu s tom izjavom); slaganjem s idejom da bi bilo dobro kada bi se poučavanje u visokome obrazovanju (u budućnosti) odvijalo na engleskome jeziku (S9; studenti se u prosjeku ne slažu s tim); slaganjem s izjavom da bi studij završili s jednakom kvalitetom kada bi bio na engleskome jeziku (S7); neslaganjem s izjavom da studij na engleskome jeziku na slovenskim sveučilištima ne donosi ikakve prednosti u usporedbi sa studiranjem na slovenskome (S6; studenti su u prosjeku bili neutralni). Istodobno, studenti su u toj skupini bili uglavnom neutralni u pogledu zahtjeva da se obrazovni procesi na slovenskim sveučilištima uvijek odvijaju na engleskome jeziku (S10; ovdje je u prosjeku bilo najviše prigovora), snažno odbacuju ideju studijskih programa na slovenskome za strane studente (S8), manje se od prosjeka slažu s izjavom da je ovladavanje slovenskim kao jezikom struke važno (S1), a više s izjavom da je sposobnost uporabe engleskoga kao jezika struke

važna (S2) te da ih studiranje na engleskome jeziku bolje priprema za zaposlenje u inozemstvu (S5).

Kombiniranjem odgovora možemo utvrditi obrazac razmišljanja koji umjesto simboličke dimenzije obilježava praktična i pragmatična dimenzija uporabe jezika u visokome obrazovanju. U toj se skupini povećana uporaba engleskoga, kao neophodna posljedica internacionalizacije, ne smatra problematičnom. U izravnoj usporedbi skupina prvenstvo daje studijskim programima na engleskome jeziku, a suprotno spoznajama iz kognitivnih i sociolingvističkih disciplina odbacuje pretpostavku da su studijski programi na materinskome jeziku kvalitetniji. U skladu s cjelokupnim prosjekom, ali izraženije, skupina naglašava važnost višejezičnosti i spremnosti studiranja na engleskome. Kao što je bilo i očekivano na temelju njihove sklonosti engleskome kao jeziku poučavanja, studenti iz te skupine protive se ideji jezičnoga protekcionizma, ponajviše ideji izvođenja studijskih programa na slovenskome jeziku za strane studente. Cijene važnost ovladavanja slovenskim kao jezikom struke manje u odnosu na prosjek, a također su u prosjeku manje skloni slovenskome i snažno podupiru uporabu engleskoga jezika.

Nadalje, ova skupina odgovara profilu studenta koji je tipičan za razvojne dokumente u kojima se nalazi većina spomenutih reformskih prijedloga. Članove skupine karakterizira ambicioznost, veća fleksibilnost i bolja prilagodba trenutnim okolnostima, što je također povezano s iznadprosječnom sposobnošću uporabe engleskoga. Daljnje analize pokazale su da ova skupina procjenjuje svoju sposobnost uporabe engleskoga jezika najvišom u svim dimenzijama, da engleski upotrebljavaju najčešće, da najviše cijene važnost i kvalitetu stručne literature na engleskome, da se najviše slažu s izjavom da bolje razumiju stručno nazivlje na engleskome nego na slovenskome, da najbolje razumiju nastavne materijale na engleskome i da se više slažu s izjavom da je razina engleskoga jezika na državnoj maturi dovoljna za učenje/razumijevanje stručnoga nazivlja na engleskome. Njihovo razumijevanje složenih pitanja uporabe jezika temelji se na jasno definiranom osobnom gledištu, usredotočenome na pojedinca i njegove ciljeve u budućemu poslu, pa stoga jezik najviše shvaćaju kao komunikacijski alat i sredstvo učinkovitoga postizanja ciljeva, a zanemaruju njegovu društveno-simboličku dimenziju i moguće društveno-političke promjene koje su povezane sa smanjenom uporabom slovenskoga jezika – ili možda ne smatraju te promjene problematičnima.

Skupina studenata orijentirana slovenskomu jeziku („za slovenski”)

Sljedeća skupina koja značajno odstupa od cjelokupne slike sudionika istraživanja jest skupina „za slovenski”, koja je veoma različita od prethodno opisane. To je ujedno i najveća skupina koja obuhvaća više od trećine svih studenata. Od prosjeka odstupa ponajviše u sljedećemu: neutralnome stavu o izjavi da bi strani studenti također trebali studirati na slovenskome (S8; studenti se u prosjeku protive toj ideji); neutralnošću

prema izjavi da su slovenski studenti koji uče engleski jezik bolje pripremljeni za zaposlenje u inozemstvu (S5; studenti se u prosjeku slažu s tom izjavom); jasnim slaganjem s izjavom da studij na engleskome jeziku ne pruža nikakve prednosti u odnosu na studij na slovenskome (S6); neslaganjem s izjavom da bi studij završili s jednakom kvalitetom da ga pohađaju na engleskome jeziku (S7; studenti su u prosjeku neutralni u vezi s tom i prethodnom izjavom). Ta je skupina također sklonija uporabi slovenskoga na objema razinama studija (S3 i S4), manje se slaže s važnošću ovladavanja engleskim kao jezikom struke (S2) i s izjavom da je uvođenje engleskoga kao jezika poučavanja korisno ili bi trebalo biti obvezno (S9 i S10; u objema je izjavama neslaganje potpuno, deklaratorno i jednoglasno).

Kombinirajući obilježja skupine možemo uočiti obrazac koji daje eksplicitnu prednost slovenskome kada se izravno uspoređuju kvaliteta i korisnost studiranja na engleskome ili slovenskome. Ne podupiru se argumenti u prilog studiranju na engleskome; potvrđuje se pretpostavka kognitivnoga prvenstva materinskoga jezika i bolje kvalitete obrazovanja na nacionalnome jeziku. Obrazac upućuje na neutralnost prema jezičnome protekcionizmu i pridaje manje važnosti ovladavanju engleskim kao jezikom struke. Iznad prosjeka odbacuje pragmatično i tržištu orijentirano viđenje sveučilišta te viđenje slovenskoga kao prepreke kvaliteti internacionalizacije; ispitanici također više nego prosječno cijene uporabu slovenskoga na objema razinama studija. Općenito, možemo govoriti o obrascu eksplicitne sklonosti slovenskome koja podržava uporabu engleskoga u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju samo na najapstraktnijoj razini načela, a definiranjem konkretnih mogućnosti uključivanja postaje jasno da se engleski zapravo odbija.

Daljnje su analize pokazale da ta skupina najniže procjenjuje sve dimenzije komunikacijskih vještina na engleskome jeziku, najviše se suprotstavlja izjavi da bolje razumiju engleski kao jezik struke od slovenskoga, najmanje se slaže s izjavom da je razina engleskoga jezika na državnoj maturi dovoljna za razumijevanje stručnoga nazivlja te ima najmanje pouzdanja u razumijevanje nastavnih materijala na engleskome jeziku. Sve navedeno upućuje na to da ta skupina promiče slovenski ne zbog načela i vrijednosti slovenskoga jezika, već je motivirana pragmatičnim procjenama nesposobnosti ispitanika da studiraju na stranome jeziku, posebno engleskome. Ta se skupina sastoji od proporcionalno manje studenata na drugoj razini bolonjskih studijskih programa i više dodiplomskih studenata sa starih programa. Ti se ispitanici rijetko služe engleskim na studiju i općenito te najmanje cijene kvalitetu i važnost literature na stranome jeziku. U usporedbi s ostalim skupinama, mnogo veći udio članova te skupine očekuje da će na poslu upotrebljavati slovenski jezik.

Studenti orijentirani višejezičnosti (kozmpoliti)

Ta skupina najmanje odstupa od ukupnoga prosjeka, no ipak odstupa. Što se njezine veličine tiče, nalazi se između dviju prethodno spomenutih skupina: čini je nešto više od trećine studenata (njezina je veličina približna onoj prethodne skupine). Znatno

odstupa od prosjeka jedino u sljedećoj izjavi: mogli bi studij završiti s jednakom kvalitetom kada bi se izvodio na engleskome jeziku (S7; studenti su u prosjeku bili neutralni). U pogledu svih ostalih izjava možemo govoriti više o razinama slaganja ili neslaganja. Ta skupina naglašava važnost ovladavanja engleskim kao jezikom struke (S2; najviše od svih skupina) i slaže se s boljim poslovnim mogućnostima u inozemstvu za studente koji studiraju na engleskome u domovini (S5); no, članovi te skupine također cijene uporabu slovenskoga na objema razinama studija više nego ostali (S3 i S4), što je u suprotnosti s prethodnim izjavama. Nešto snažnije od drugih odbacuju stajalište da bi strani studenti na slovenskim sveučilištima trebali studirati na slovenskome jeziku (S8).

Kombiniramo li stajališta, možemo uočiti obrazac u kojemu se višejezičnost i međukulturnost cijene više od pojedinih jezika i u kojemu je prepoznavanje simboličke i komunikacijske ili pragmatične dimenzije slovenskoga i engleskoga jezika u ravnoteži. Podrška uporabi slovenskoga kao dominantnoga jezika poučavanja na svim razinama studija jest visoka, ali je izbalansirana svjesnošću o prednostima komunikacije na engleskome. Ta skupina stoga na temelju procjene kognitivne sposobnosti studiranja na engleskome, odbacuje pretpostavku o boljoj kvaliteti obrazovanja kada se poučavanje izvodi na materinskome jeziku, a temi pristupa umjereno. Skupina ne podržava protekcionizam ili prvenstvo pojedinoga jezika, ali zagovara visoko funkcionalne jezične vještine u obama jezicima i njihovo razumno kombiniranje. Članovi te skupine pokazuju fleksibilnost i spremnost za moguće povećanje uporabe engleskoga tijekom studija koje proizlazi iz moguće internacionalizacije; svoje vještine u engleskome jeziku procjenjuju nešto višima od prosjeka, slično skupini za engleski jezik. Svoje znanje engleskoga procjenjuju višima u svim dimenzijama, kao i važnost stručne literature na engleskome; literaturu i nastavne materijale na engleskome razumiju bolje od drugih skupina te se slažu s izjavom da je znanje engleskoga jezika na državnoj maturi dovoljno za razumijevanje stručne literature na engleskome. No, njihovo stajalište prema jezicima, u usporedbi sa skupinom za engleski jezik, uravnoteženo je te prepoznaju važnost višejezičnosti i međukulturnosti. Studenti iz te skupine naglašavaju važnost potpuno funkcionalnoga slovenskog jezika i odbacuju tržištu okrenutu i pragmatičnu logiku uvođenja engleskoga na štetu slovenskoga, što se smatra preprekom internacionalizaciji visokoga obrazovanja. Nadalje, ne odabiru ni jedan od dvaju jezika pri usporedbi prednosti studiranja na engleskome i slovenskome jeziku. To je, osim toga, tipično gledište studenata na Sveučilištu u Ljubljani.

Studenti i nastavnici – uopćavanje rezultata

Tri skupine nastavnika nisu se razlikovale od skupina studenata (ni u stavovima ni u veličini), no usmjerenje njihovih stavova nešto je više naglašeno nego studenata (Kalin Golob i sur., 2014). Stoga možemo sažeti konačne zaključke koji vrijede za obje skupine dionika.

Skupina studenata i nastavnika „za slovenski” (najveća skupina), iako na deklarativnoj razini svjesna neizbježnosti i važnosti ovladavanja engleskim jezikom u kontekstu

suvremenoga europskoga visokog obrazovanja, izražava snažnu sklonost uporabi engleskoga jezika u svim svojim stajalištima o ulozi jezika poučavanja u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju. Ipak, rezultati samoprocjene vještina engleskoga jezika pokazuju da je ta skupina ostvarila najniži rezultat, što nas navodi na zaključak da njihova sklonost slovenskome ne proizlazi nužno samo iz njihove svjesnosti simboličke uloge jezika, shvaćanja slovenskoga kao vrijednosti i vjerovanja u kognitivno prvenstvo materinskoga jezika, već da barem djelomice ima veze s njihovim osjećajem nedostatne sposobnosti za studiranje ili poučavanje na engleskome jeziku.

S druge strane, skupina studenata i nastavnika „za engleski” (najmanja skupina) ne problematizira već podržava povećanu uporabu engleskoga kao (neizbježnu) posljedicu internacionalizacije visokoga obrazovanja, pozivajući se na bolje obrazovne i poslovne mogućnosti koje su navodno povezane sa studiranjem na engleskome jeziku i oslanjajući se na svoje iznadprosječno znanje engleskoga.

Stajališta kozmopolitske skupine (skupina srednje veličine) najbliža su onima koje su temelj europskih i slovenskih jezičnih politika i Nacionalnoga programa 2014. – 2018. Ta skupina studenata i nastavnika ne teži prvenstvu jednoga od dvaju jezika, već visokoj sposobnosti uporabe obaju jezika i njihovu razumnome kombiniranju.

Zaključci

Preporuke za jezičnu politiku u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju

Rezultati istraživanja upućuju na složenost suvremenih pitanja visokoga obrazovanja u kojemu se sveopća deklarativna nastojanja vezana uz internacionalizaciju te sve veću kvalitetu ne temelje na ključnim razmatranjima važnosti pojmova i mjera potrebnih za njihovo osiguranje. Razmatranje koje nikada nije u potpunosti i sustavno izvedeno također se odnosi i na pitanje jezika u visokome obrazovanju.

To je pitanje s jedne strane povezano s nacionalnom jezičnom politikom, a s druge s nacionalnom politikom visokoga obrazovanja i politikom obrazovanja i znanosti; neizravno je regulirano zakonskim normama u drugim poljima. Od ključne je važnosti uzeti to u obzir pri razmatranju toga pitanja; u suprotnome, rješenja mogu biti djelomična ili čak proturječna.

Na temelju teorijskih polazišta, usporedivih istraživanja i provedenih ispitivanja i intervjuva, možemo potvrditi sljedeće:

- prema studentima, uporaba je materinskoga jezika važna za kvalitetu studija
- za potpuno funkcionalan slovenski kao standardiziran jezik njegova je uporaba u znanosti i na sveučilištu iznimno važna
- internacionalizacija obogaćuje obrazovni proces i pridonosi njegovoj kvaliteti
- zakoni i strateški dokumenti u Sloveniji nisu usklađeni, što vodi improvizaciji u promicanju internacionalizacije
- internacionalizacija u uvjetima nedostatnih financijskih resursa ne potiče kvalitetu
- u nedostatku pravnoga, stručnoga, financijskoga i strateškoga okvira, implementacija internacionalizacije prepuštena je fakultetima ili čak pojedincima

koji odlučuju na temelju trenutnih okolnosti i vlastitoga razumijevanja internacionalizacije

- takvo se razumijevanje internacionalizacije odražava u trima utvrđenim tipovima stavova prema jeziku: prevladavajućega „za slovenski”, nešto slabijega „kozmpolitskoga” i slabijega „za engleski”
- cilj jezične politike koju podržavamo i predlažemo jest kretanje prema kozmpolitskome stajalištu.
- Kako bi se ostvarila takva promjena stava, predlažemo sljedeće mjere na razmatranje donositeljima odluka:
- normalizacija jezične svjesnosti
- osiguranje formalnoga zakonskog okvira kao odgovornost države
- razvoj i operacionalizacija jezične strategije kao odgovornost sveučilišta.

Status slovenskoga i drugih jezika u slovenskome visokom obrazovanju mora se formalno i zakonski regulirati na način koji osigurava razvoj slovenskoga i visokokvalitetnu internacionalizaciju, istodobno omogućujući fleksibilnu prilagodbu novim mogućnostima i potrebama.

No, zakonska odredba sama po sebi nije dovoljna za istinski konstruktivno jezično planiranje. Odgovorno bi ministarstvo stoga trebalo pružiti okvir za jezično planiranje koji bi visokoobrazovne institucije mogle upotrijebiti kao polazište za uvođenje jezičnih propisa prilagođenih njima i za uključivanje u njihove statute.

Odgovorno bi ministarstvo trebalo poticati uspostavljanje okvira za jezično planiranje i uspostavljanje dobre jezične prakse (za slovenski i strane jezike) posebnim financijskim instrumentima. To također podrazumijeva definirane standarde izvrsnosti u uporabi jezika koji bi trebali biti dobro osmišljeni i utemeljeni na stručnome mišljenju.

Odgovorna jezična politika ima važnu ulogu u očuvanju potpune funkcionalnosti slovenskoga jezika i osiguranju kvalitete i posebnosti slovenskoga nacionalnoga visokog obrazovanja. Jedino s potpuno funkcionalnim nacionalnim jezikom slovenska politika i društvo mogu doprinijeti ostvarivanju europskoga prostora visokoga obrazovanja budući da on, kao i ideja Europske unije, postoji isključivo na temeljima jezične i kulturološke različitosti.